

# MEMORANDUM

<b>To:</b> Sunfield Fast Track Expert Panel	<b>From:</b> Brett Harries
<b>cc:</b>	<b>HTE File:</b> epa01
<b>cc:</b>	<b>Date:</b> 22 February 2026

**Re: Transportation Peer Review**  
**Response to Panel Queries re Modified Employment Parking Ratios**

## 1 Introduction

1. My name is Brett Harries of Harries Transportation Engineers Limited. I have previously provided my qualifications and experience to the Expert Panel. I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023 (Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses), and I confirm that I have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum.
2. The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to two matters for which the Expert Panel is seeking further advice. The two matters are as follows:
  - a) Review Commute's justification for a proposal to increase the allowable parking for office and industrial activities in the employment precinct.
  - b) Provide the Panel with advice on the implications in relation to transportation effects and achieving the aim of limiting car travel to and from the proposed development.
3. To assist in my responding to these two queries, the following documents have been provided to me:
  - a) Tattico letter of 17 February 2025<sup>1</sup> re Response to Minute 25 – Comments on Draft Conditions
  - b) Applicant Feedback on Conditions – 17 February 2026
  - a) Commute letter of 16 February 2026 re Sunfield employment precinct parking ratios.
4. In essence, what is now being sought by the Applicant is an amendment to the maximum parking for office activities (from 1 space per 300m<sup>2</sup> to 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup>); and for warehouse / industrial activities (from 1 space per 500m<sup>2</sup> to 1 space per 250m<sup>2</sup>).

---

<sup>1</sup> Presumably meant to be 2026n

## 2 Analysis and Assessment of the Modified Parking Proposal

5. As the Expert Panel will now be well familiar with, the underlying philosophy of the proposed Sunfield development is to achieve a high level of transportation sustainability. The levers proposed to achieve this include:
  - a) internalising trips within the development by providing a fully integrated development that minimises the need for travel on the external road network for activities such as employment, shopping, education, medical, etc.;
  - b) provision of the frequent Sun Bus service to connect the development to the Papakura and Takanini town centres and to regional train services; and
  - c) heavy constraints to on-site parking supplies to encourage / reinforce a) and b) above.
6. As described in my Transportation Peer Review memorandum (11 November 2025), (“Peer Review Memo”), the two primary transportation risks associated with the Sunfield proposal relate to:
  - a) the impacts to the capacity / performance of the surrounding road network due to generated traffic demands; and
  - b) the enduring impacts to existing and future residential neighbourhoods that will surround the Sunfield site due to off-site spill-over of on-street parking demands into areas where available on-street parking supplies are already scarce.
7. Of these two transportation risk areas, it is my professional opinion that in the circumstances of this proposal, the risk of parking demand spillover into surrounding residential neighbourhoods is the more critical of the two.
8. As I noted in the Peer Review Memo, I am comfortable with the modelling undertaken of the performance of the road network, especially given the availability of the Auckland Forecast Centre SATURN model as developed for the MRS2A NoR; and because the modelling adopted an appropriately robust peak hour trip total of 3,000 vehicles / hour.
9. With an increased maximum allowable parking supply for employment activities, there will inevitably be some level of increased trip generating potential, (which to date has not been quantified). In this case however, there will unlikely be a linear relationship between increased parking provision and trip generation. I note in this regard that with the previous heavily constrained parking supply, there would still have been a significant number of vehicular trips generated by employees who do not live on-site, and who do not have access to train services that would otherwise enable travel to the site by the Sunbus. For those employee vehicle trips, which are not associated with an on-site carpark, they would likely either result in off-site parking within surrounding residential areas, or would involve ‘double-trips’ associated with employee drop-off and pick-ups by another driver.
10. This means that while the modified employee parking provisions will inevitably result in some level of increased demand for car travel, it is unlikely to be a dramatic increase. For these reasons, the provision of potentially more employee parking should unlikely compromise the overall transport sustainability philosophy of the development.
11. While I understand that no new modelling has been undertaken to quantify the likely extent of any trip generation increase, and the likely implications of that increase on the performance of the surrounding road network, at a conceptual level, I consider that the currently proposed regime of monitoring conditions will enable any variations in

generated road network impacts to be identified, and if necessary further mitigation measures developed.

12. As noted above, it is reasonable to expect that a not insignificant proportion of employees will have little option other than to drive to/from work (because they do not live on-site or they do not have access to a train / the Sunbus). With heavily constrained on-site parking for these employees, their only alternative is to park off-site. These off-site parking demands have the potential to materially impact on existing and future residential neighbourhoods that surround the Sunfield site. These off-site parking demands will be difficult to mitigate if on-site parking remains heavily constrained, and they will be enduring.
13. If on-site parking provisions for employees are increased as now proposed, then that will substantially reduce the demand for off-site parking, which is a material benefit of the current proposal.

### 3 Summary and Conclusion

14. The currently proposed higher maximum parking rates for office activities (1 per 300m<sup>2</sup> increased to 1 per 30m<sup>2</sup>) and warehouse / industrial activities (1 per 500m<sup>2</sup> increased to 1 per 250m<sup>2</sup>), will inevitably increase the trip generating potential of the Sunfield site. However, the quantum of generated traffic increases will in this case likely be less than would be expected if (in this case) parking provision increases were linearly related to trip generation increases. In any event, the trip generation increases that do occur will be subject to monitoring conditions and subsequent additional mitigation measures if required.
15. When considered in the round, the applicability and extents of the parking provision increases will unlikely compromise the overall transportation sustainability of the proposal.
16. Any negative trip generation impacts that do arise due to the parking provision increases will, in my professional opinion, be more than off-set by the positive implications associated with the material de-risking of the extents of potential parking spillover impacts to surrounding residential neighbourhoods. While there are multiple means by which a transport system can be modified and / or adapt (to greater or lesser degrees) to increased traffic demands, the options available to effectively mitigate generated off-site parking impacts are significantly more limited.
17. In my opinion therefore, the currently proposed increases to employee parking provisions can be accepted as resulting in a de-risking of the off-site parking impacts of the proposal, without significantly adding to the risk of an unmanageable road network performance.

B Harries

**Harries Transportation Engineers Limited**