

MEMORANDUM

To: Expert Consenting Panel – Ashbourne From: Michelle Seymour
(Commute)

Date: 18 November 2025

Subject: Ashbourne: Additional Information

1 Introduction

The following memo has been prepared to respond to requests for further information from Matamata Piako District Council (MPDC) and comments from invited parties with regard to the proposed Ashbourne development.

This memo provides assessment of additional transport matters that have been raised by the above parties, and also provides commentary of key design changes that have occurred since the preparation of the Ashbourne ITA – specifically

- Smith Street
- Road Safety
- Proposed walking and cycling connections
- Future connections south of the site
- The provision of a commercial node
- Recommended Stages and upgrades

This memo should be read in conjunction with the Ashbourne ITA, and the responses included in the summary tables.

1.1 Smith Street

The performance of the Smith Street and Station Road intersection was raised by a number of submitters and Gray Matter on behalf of MPDC.

As such additional surveys of the Smith Street/Station Road intersection were completed on 18/09/25. Traffic distribution was then reallocated to utilise Smith Street, based on a 30% residential (the most conservative assumption provided in the MPDC review) and 100% of northbound retirement village traffic, and a 90% northbound/10% south bound in the AM peak, and vice versa.

The results of this modelling can be found attached to this memo.

The general findings are:

- The peak hour of the intersection occurs as a consequence of school drop off and pick times. This results in a busy 20-30mins, with traffic demands outside of this period being considerably lower.
- The intersection continues to perform well with the additional traffic demands. As such no additional turning lanes are recommended.

- No parking within the intersection or in a location that presented any safety concerns were observed.
- Very limited pedestrian movements were observed crossing the intersection, and such a formal zebra crossing or similar is not considered to be required. A pedestrian refuge, however, is supported to provide a crossing point following the connection to Station Road being implemented, alongside the provision of the upgraded pedestrian facilities on Station Road.
- The MPDC review has also requested a pedestrian refuge on Smith Street. I consider it more appropriate to encourage pedestrians to use the existing crossings on Smith Street and Station Road, located directly outside the schools, as this provides a safer outcome.

1.2 Road Safety

Following a number of submissions received regarding safety, an updated assessment of the surrounding area's safety record has been carried out using the NZTA CAS database, for the five-year period between 2020 and 2024 as well as any crashes entered for 2025. The search included all reported crashes along Station Road from Smith Street to Firth Street/State Highway 27 (SH27). Additional analysis was undertaken over a 50m radius around each of the Station Road/Smith Street, Station Road/SH27, Jellicoe Road /SH27 and Jellicoe Road/Hampton Terrace intersections.

The following crashes were returned from the above CAS search:

- One crash of serious severity at the intersection of Jellicoe Road and SH27. A southbound vehicle on SH27 failed to notice an oncoming motorcyclist when initiating a turn onto Jellicoe Road, where the resulting collision caused injury to the cyclist.
- One minor severity crash at the intersection of Station Road and SH27, where similarly a vehicle turning off SH27 onto station road failed to give way to an oncoming cyclist causing a collision.
- One non-injury crash also at the Station Road/SH27 intersection, the result of a poorly completed turn from Station Road onto SH27 and the collision of the turning car with a stationary car parked near the intersection on SH27.
- One non-injury crash on Station Road as a consequence of a vehicle sliding uncontrollably off the carriageway due to wet weather conditions and striking a light pole.

Based on the above crash data, there is no history of crashes occurring relating specifically to movements into and out of the existing site accesses, or a particular crash pattern in the area. Therefore, from the assessment of the crash history, there is no indication of any significant safety concerns from the subject site.

1.3 Expected Traffic Volumes

The ITA relies on several conservative assumptions to test a "worst-case" scenario, including:

- No connection to Station Road for any stage of the development.
- All residential traffic using Jellicoe Road to access SH27, rather than distributing between Jellicoe Road and Hampton Terrace.

With the updated staging now requiring an additional connection at Firth Street or Station Road once 400 dwellings are reached, these assumptions are even more conservative than what will occur in practice.

I also consider the MPDC assessment to be conservative for the following reasons:

- Traffic counts on Station Road record approximately 620 vehicles per day (5-day ADT).
- The peak-hour surveys showed morning and evening peaks of 11% and 10% of daily flows respectively.

Using 15% as a peak-to-daily ratio is therefore a conservative input.

- Assigning the full development traffic to Hampton Terrace overstates likely effects on this corridor, as traffic will distribute between Hampton Terrace and Jellicoe Road.
- Applying blanket road classifications based solely on traffic volumes can be problematic, because in practice some lower-order roads legitimately carry higher volumes while some higher-order roads carry less, meaning volume alone doesn't always reflect how a road is designed to function or perform.

Overall, I am of the opinion that the traffic effects of the development can be managed for the following reasons:

- Current traffic volumes on the surrounding local roads are very low, generally in the range of 150–350 vehicles per day. This means there is substantial available capacity before these roads reach the thresholds typically associated with a need for upgraded infrastructure.
- The more substantial increases in traffic occur only after multiple stages have been built and occupied. Early stages do not generate traffic of a scale that would materially alter how Peakedale Drive, Jellicoe Road, Archford Street, or Hampton Terrace operate today.
- By the time the development approaches the levels where volumes become comparable to collector or arterial functions, alternative access routes including Firth Street connection can be implemented. This allows infrastructure investment to be timed with actual effects rather than imposed prematurely. I support the use of supplementary ITAs at development stages to confirm when this will be required.
- Staging infrastructure in this manner aligns with common practice, where upgrades are introduced when a development reaches thresholds that materially change road performance—not at the earliest stages when traffic effects remain modest.
- With connections in place at Station Road and SH27, the traffic volumes on Peakedale Road will decrease, and the overall roading scheme will enable a number of connection points for vehicles.

1.4 Proposed Walking and Cycling Connections

Pedestrian connections have been altered since the preparation of the ITA, with connections removed from the Eldonwood development and the Highgrove development.

While ideally there would be connections through these sites, to increase pedestrian permeability, I note that the development has retained a high level of pedestrian facilities within the site, and connections will be provided from Road 1 to Station Road. A number of wider network improvements are also proposed:

- Upgrades on Station Road include a 3m sealed shared path between the Retirement Village and Smith Road
- A pedestrian refuge on Station Road to facilitate crossing
- Kerb cut down/pram crossings and footpath connections at the intersection Hampton Terrace and Jellicoe Road.

Further reviews of required improvements will be included in subsequent ITAs prepared for each respective stage of development.

1.5 Future Connections to the South of the Site

The development plans have been updated to enable a connection to the south of the site, should development continue in the future.

1.6 Provision of a Commercial Node

The provision of commercial node has now been confirmed, and the all-residential scenario has been removed. As detailed in the ITA, the provision of commercial nodes has the following advantages from a transport planning perspective:

- Internal trip capture, where residents and workers can meet their daily needs within the development, reducing external traffic volumes.
- Reduced peak-hour traffic volumes, as mixed-use areas can distribute traffic more evenly throughout the day due to varied land uses.
- Encouragement of active travel, with shorter travel distances supporting walking and cycling.
- Improved trip efficiency, with opportunities for trip chaining (e.g., combining errands with commutes) reducing the total number of vehicle trip.

1.7 Recommended Stages and Upgrades

The following table provides a summary of the recommended staging and required infrastructure,

Development Stage	Required Infrastructure to enable this stage	ITA required
Stage 1 (68 lots)	Continuous footpath network to Station Road (via Jellicoe Road) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of pram crossing and footpath connections from existing Jellicoe Road footpath to existing Hampton Terrace footpath. 	No
Stage 2 (145 lots)	As for Stage 1	No
Stage 3 (217 lots)	As for Stage 2 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Construction traffic to travel via a temporary access route from Station Road or construction of a new road connection from Firth Street Mitigation within the existing residential area as identified in ITA 	Yes
Stage 4 (277 lots plus commercial development)	As for Stage 3 plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right turn bay on Station Road or construction of a new road connection to Firth Street A formed connection to Station Road (including a right turn bay) must be completed by the earlier of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completion of the first 400 residential Lots 1,850m² of commercial activities has been delivered unless:	Yes

Development Stage	Required Infrastructure to enable this stage	ITA required
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A structured road connection to Firth Street has been completed. ● Should a formed connection to Station Road be provided then the following will also be required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Urbanisation of Station Road (southern side eastwards from Road 1 intersection to existing urban edge) ○ Construction of a 3m wide sealed shared path on Station Road between Smith Street and Road 1 ○ Pedestrian refuge island on Smith Street at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection ○ Pedestrian refuge island on Station Road at the Smith Street/Station Road intersection (located between Sheffield and Smith Streets) ● Mitigation identified within the existing residential areas as identified in the ITA 	
Stage 5 (337 lots)	As per Stage 4	Yes
Stage 6 (389 lots)	As per Stage 5	No
Stage 7 (451 lots)	As per Stage 6	No
Stage 8 (518 lots)	As per Stage 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of Road 1 to Station Road including a right turn bay on Station Road (if not completed as part of an earlier stage) 	No

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

STOP Site: 101 [Smith Street AM Existing]

New Site
Stop (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles											
Mov ID	OD Mov	Demand Flows Total veh/h	HV %	Deg. Satn v/c	Average Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back of Queue Vehicles veh	Distance m	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate per veh	Average Speed km/h
South: Eldonwood Street											
1	L2	3	0.0	0.002	8.1	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.10	0.92	51.8
2	T1	28	0.0	0.102	8.9	LOS A	0.4	2.5	0.41	0.94	50.7
3	R2	45	0.0	0.102	10.5	LOS B	0.4	2.5	0.41	0.94	50.5
Approach		77	0.0	0.102	9.8	LOS A	0.4	2.5	0.40	0.94	50.6
East: Station Road (East)											
4	L2	25	0.0	0.095	5.8	LOS A	0.5	3.2	0.19	0.44	53.9
5	T1	32	0.0	0.095	0.2	LOS A	0.5	3.2	0.19	0.44	55.3
6	R2	107	0.0	0.095	5.8	LOS A	0.5	3.2	0.19	0.44	53.6
Approach		164	0.0	0.095	4.7	NA	0.5	3.2	0.19	0.44	54.0
North: Smith Street											
7	L2	199	0.0	0.144	8.2	LOS A	0.6	4.4	0.14	0.91	51.8
8	T1	19	0.0	0.060	8.8	LOS A	0.2	1.5	0.34	0.91	51.3
9	R2	32	0.0	0.060	8.9	LOS A	0.2	1.5	0.34	0.91	51.1
Approach		249	0.0	0.144	8.3	LOS A	0.6	4.4	0.18	0.91	51.6
West: Station Road (West)											
10	L2	39	0.0	0.047	5.6	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.27	56.0
11	T1	47	0.0	0.047	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.27	57.5
12	R2	2	0.0	0.047	5.7	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.27	55.8
Approach		88	0.0	0.047	2.6	NA	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.27	56.8
All Vehicles		579	0.0	0.144	6.6	NA	0.6	4.4	0.19	0.68	52.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

STOP Site: 101 [Smith Street PM Existing]

New Site
Stop (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles											
Mov ID	OD Mov	Demand Flows Total veh/h	HV %	Deg. Satn v/c	Average Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back of Queue Vehicles veh	Distance m	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate per veh	Average Speed km/h
South: Eldonwood Street											
1	L2	2	0.0	0.002	8.2	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.12	0.90	51.8
2	T1	21	0.0	0.046	8.6	LOS A	0.2	1.1	0.33	0.92	51.3
3	R2	18	0.0	0.046	9.4	LOS A	0.2	1.1	0.33	0.92	51.0
Approach		41	0.0	0.046	8.9	LOS A	0.2	1.1	0.32	0.92	51.2
East: Station Road (East)											
4	L2	26	0.0	0.091	5.7	LOS A	0.4	3.0	0.13	0.40	54.5
5	T1	45	0.0	0.091	0.1	LOS A	0.4	3.0	0.13	0.40	55.9
6	R2	92	0.0	0.091	5.6	LOS A	0.4	3.0	0.13	0.40	54.2
Approach		163	0.0	0.091	4.1	NA	0.4	3.0	0.13	0.40	54.7
North: Smith Street											
7	L2	117	0.0	0.083	8.1	LOS A	0.3	2.4	0.09	0.94	51.8
8	T1	20	0.0	0.066	8.7	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.30	0.91	51.5
9	R2	38	0.0	0.066	8.6	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.30	0.91	51.2
Approach		175	0.0	0.083	8.3	LOS A	0.3	2.4	0.16	0.93	51.6
West: Station Road (West)											
10	L2	24	0.0	0.025	5.6	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.31	55.7
11	T1	22	0.0	0.025	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.31	57.2
12	R2	1	0.0	0.025	5.7	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.31	55.4
Approach		47	0.0	0.025	3.0	NA	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.31	56.4
All Vehicles		426	0.0	0.091	6.2	NA	0.4	3.0	0.15	0.65	53.2

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

STOP Site: 101 [Smith Street AM Growth plus Development]

New Site
Stop (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles											
Mov ID	OD Mov	Demand Flows Total veh/h	HV %	Deg. Satn v/c	Average Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back of Queue Vehicles veh	Queue Distance m	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate per veh	Average Speed km/h
South: Eldonwood Street											
1	L2	3	0.0	0.002	8.2	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.14	0.90	51.8
2	T1	32	0.0	0.149	10.3	LOS B	0.5	3.6	0.54	0.99	49.4
3	R2	49	0.0	0.149	13.2	LOS B	0.5	3.6	0.54	0.99	49.2
Approach		84	0.0	0.149	11.9	LOS B	0.5	3.6	0.52	0.99	49.4
East: Station Road (East)											
4	L2	27	0.0	0.189	6.0	LOS A	1.0	7.0	0.26	0.46	53.6
5	T1	55	0.0	0.189	0.4	LOS A	1.0	7.0	0.26	0.46	55.0
6	R2	234	0.0	0.189	5.9	LOS A	1.0	7.0	0.26	0.46	53.4
Approach		316	0.0	0.189	5.0	NA	1.0	7.0	0.26	0.46	53.6
North: Smith Street											
7	L2	265	0.0	0.194	8.3	LOS A	0.9	6.3	0.17	0.90	51.8
8	T1	21	0.0	0.110	10.1	LOS B	0.4	2.7	0.47	0.95	50.4
9	R2	52	0.0	0.110	10.5	LOS B	0.4	2.7	0.47	0.95	50.2
Approach		338	0.0	0.194	8.7	LOS A	0.9	6.3	0.23	0.91	51.4
West: Station Road (West)											
10	L2	68	0.0	0.067	5.6	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.32	55.6
11	T1	57	0.0	0.067	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.32	57.1
12	R2	2	0.0	0.067	5.7	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.32	55.4
Approach		127	0.0	0.067	3.1	NA	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.32	56.3
All Vehicles		865	0.0	0.194	6.8	NA	1.0	7.0	0.24	0.67	52.7

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

STOP Site: 101 [Smith Street PM Growth and Development]

New Site
Stop (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles											
Mov ID	OD Mov	Demand Flows Total veh/h	HV %	Deg. Satn v/c	Average Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back of Queue Vehicles veh	Queue Distance m	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate per veh	Average Speed km/h
South: Eldonwood Street											
1	L2	2	0.0	0.002	8.2	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.14	0.89	51.8
2	T1	23	0.0	0.064	9.3	LOS A	0.2	1.5	0.44	0.94	50.5
3	R2	20	0.0	0.064	11.5	LOS B	0.2	1.5	0.44	0.94	50.3
Approach		45	0.0	0.064	10.2	LOS B	0.2	1.5	0.42	0.94	50.4
East: Station Road (East)											
4	L2	29	0.0	0.135	5.8	LOS A	0.7	4.8	0.20	0.41	54.1
5	T1	59	0.0	0.135	0.3	LOS A	0.7	4.8	0.20	0.41	55.5
6	R2	147	0.0	0.135	5.8	LOS A	0.7	4.8	0.20	0.41	53.9
Approach		236	0.0	0.135	4.4	NA	0.7	4.8	0.20	0.41	54.3
North: Smith Street											
7	L2	244	0.0	0.177	8.2	LOS A	0.8	5.6	0.14	0.91	51.8
8	T1	22	0.0	0.118	9.4	LOS A	0.4	2.9	0.40	0.93	51.0
9	R2	67	0.0	0.118	9.5	LOS A	0.4	2.9	0.40	0.93	50.8
Approach		334	0.0	0.177	8.5	LOS A	0.8	5.6	0.21	0.91	51.5
West: Station Road (West)											
10	L2	43	0.0	0.047	5.5	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.29	55.9
11	T1	44	0.0	0.047	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.29	57.4
12	R2	1	0.0	0.047	5.8	LOS A	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.29	55.6
Approach		88	0.0	0.047	2.8	NA	0.0	0.1	0.01	0.29	56.6
All Vehicles		703	0.0	0.177	6.5	NA	0.8	5.6	0.19	0.67	52.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.