

Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – Delmore Substantive Application Technical Addendum

FTAA-2502-1015 / BUN60444768

1.0 Technical Specialist - Traffic Engineering- Philips Augustine- Auckland Council Traffic Engineer

From: Philips Augustine

Date: 17-07-2025

2.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

My memorandum comments on the Delmore proposal from a traffic safety issues and congestion perspective. Auckland Transport has also provided detailed comments on the Application. This memorandum should be read in conjunction with Auckland Transport's comments. The principal matters which remain outstanding following my review of the applicant's updated information of 7 July are:

1. A monitoring and mitigation condition for the Grand Drive/ SH1 interchange intersection at 670 dwellings
2. Non-compliance with loading bay requirements
3. Non-compliance of vehicle tracking requirements

3.0 Specialist Assessment – Previous Memo / Comments Overview

Summary of 25/06 Issues identified

In summary, the key matters and issues identified in my previous memo were:

1. Traffic calming/ speed management measures - The applicant has confirmed that the proposal will follow PC79DV requirements, and a condition is acceptable.
2. Sidra modelling - LOS changed from F to C, with queuing reduced from 680m to 230m. Request to provide further details.
3. Spacing between the garage door and the property boundary - The applicant has confirmed that 5.2/ 6.1m/ 6.9m will be maintained between the garage door and the property boundary. This is considered acceptable.
4. Safety issue due to the Pedestrian path's high gradient - The applicant confirmed that high friction finishes on the concrete footpaths with gradients steeper than 8%, and a condition is acceptable.
5. Active mode connections towards the town centre via path across SH1 to the existing paths on the east side - This is a requirement of the Ara Hills consent; however, the timing has not been

provided. A condition will be added to ensure the active mode path is constructed before the residential dwellings are occupied.

6. Vehicle crossing width - The applicant has confirmed that individual vehicle crossings will be 2.75m wide and this is considered acceptable.
7. Infringement of safety platform (4.0m length with a 5.0% gradient platform) - The applicant agreed to add as a condition to maintain fence height to 0.6m and maintain splays of 2.0 x 2.5 m with <0.6m landscape/fence, and is considered acceptable.
8. Loading bay provision - The applicant confirmed that no loading bays will be provided in JOAL or anywhere as part of the proposal. However, AC-TE does not support non-compliance. The applicant has indicated that a separate memo will be provided. However, no updated memo has been received at the time of writing.
9. Lighting plan - No lighting design has been provided. The AC-TE does not support non-compliance. Request to provide further details.
10. Lane narrowing between lots 154 & 55 at JOAL 6 - The applicant has confirmed that JOAL 6 will be 3.5m wide for 25m. This corridor has clear sight visibility, and priority marking will be provided. This will be added as a condition.
11. Vehicle Tracking (VT) overlaps with kerb buildout in multiple locations - The AC-TE does not support the non-compliance. Request to provide further details.
12. Internal garage dimension - 3m x 5m & 6m x 5m is proposed, where 3mx5.4 & 6mx5.4m required. The AC-TE does not support non-compliance. Request to provide further details.
13. Road 17 / Upper Orewa Road Sight Distance - The AC-TE does not support the non-compliance. Request to provide further details.
14. PC79/ E27 infringements - accessible parking and loading bay - both not provided. The applicant has indicated that a separate memo will be provided. However, no updated memo has been received at the time of writing.
15. Additional conditions were proposed in relation to matters above.

4.0 Specialist Assessment – Material Reviewed

Review of 07/07 Updates

Following review of the Applicants updated material, I update on the matters above under the same paragraph number:

1. The applicant has accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
2. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
However, I recommend a condition be added to ensure the Grand Drive/ SH1 interchange needs to be monitored further from the applicant's side by a qualified Traffic Engineer to determine the efficiency and safety when the proposed development reaches 670 residential occupation. The report must be submitted to Auckland Council for further assessment, and the required mitigation measures addressed.
More than the Delore residents, the traffic congestion will affect the existing users who are currently using the interchange. The applicant also mentioned that the users will select different routes if the congestion is high on the main route (eg: Road 17 / Upper Orewa Road). However,

for a safe & efficient travel, we must make the required network upgrades and make the users select the route respectively.

3. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
4. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
5. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
I recommend making minor changes on condition #147 to ensure the activemode connection is addressed efficiently.
6. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
7. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
8. The applicant responded that the rubbish truck will be partially blocking vehicle crossings of adjacent lots for very short periods during the collection period, and AC Traffic Engineering agreed with it. However, the rubbish truck was one of the scenarios. Considering the high rate of proposed residential development, there will be many deliveries, including furniture movers, on the premises. These actions will take more than a fraction.
Noted, there are residential developments with no loading bay provisions. However, the provision of a designated loading bay will always support efficient usage. Considering the above reasoning, I am not in a position to support the non-compliance of the **loading bay**.
9. The applicant's request to accept the lighting design as a condition can be considered, noting this can be done without any major site constraints. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
Noted that the applicant prefers to add the **lighting plan** as a condition, and a draft design has been provided as referred to in "Appendix 51.7 - Updated Streetlighting Plans". However, not all the JOAL's and no pedestrian paths (public paths) are covered in the plan.
Considering the high scale of residential development with a large number of JOALS and pedestrian paths, I recommend a condition be added to ensure the pedestrian path and JOALS lighting locations are also to be reviewed by a traffic engineer.
10. The applicant accepted the condition. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
11. Noted that the applicant prefers to re-check the **vehicle tracking** and required widening at the EPA stage. However, failed tracking will create ongoing maintenance, safety issues and redesigning of light pole locations. Considering the above reasoning, I am not in a position to support the non-compliance of vehicle tracking.
12. The applicant accepted the 3.0x5.4m² & 6.0x5.4m² internal dimensions. Hence, the design is considered acceptable. No further comments from a traffic point of view.
13. No further comments from a traffic point of view. The proposed roundabout design at Upper Orewa Road doesn't require any land acquisition. I have reviewed conditions #100, 104, and 105 under "Engineering Standards Compliance" in the document "Appendix 57_Proposed Conditions" _ pg.22/66, to ensure a Safe Systems Audit will be carried out and the Upper Orewa Road roundabout is constructed prior to the occupation of more than 750 dwellings.
14. The applicant responded that a total of 51 accessible parking (AP) spaces are required; however, AP can be considered as a part of secondary parking. There are >100 driveways with AP dimensions and a 1:25 gradient. This is considered acceptable and no further comments from a traffic point of view.
Loading zone- not supportive. Refer to item #2.
15. The applicant accepted all the conditions. No further comments from a traffic point of view.

5.0 Specialist Assessment – Addendum – Outstanding Issues / Information Gaps

At the time of writing this Memo, and having reviewed the 7 July updates from the Applicant, I have identified the following outstanding issues:

The key outstanding/new issues are as follows:

1. Sidra modelling - The applicant responded that the Sidra modelling is based on a 30% reduction and additional details provided in the AT and NZTA response part within the same report. More than the Delore residents, the traffic congestion will affect the existing users who are currently using the interchange. The applicant also mentioned that the users will select different routes if the congestion is high on the main route (eg: Road 17 / Upper Orewa Road). However, for a safe & efficient travel, we must make the required network upgrades and make the users select the route respectively.

I recommend a condition be added to ensure the Grand Drive/ SH1 interchange needs to be monitored further from the applicant's side by a qualified Traffic Engineer to determine the delay/ congestion when the proposed development reaches 670 residential occupation. The report must be submitted to Auckland Council for further assessment, and the required mitigation measures to be addressed respectively. I have reviewed the condition in this regard in AT's updated comments and support it.

2. Loading bay provision - The applicant responded that the rubbish truck will be partially blocking vehicle crossings of adjacent lots for very short periods during the collection period, and AC TE agreed with it. However, the rubbish truck was one of the scenarios. Considering the high rate of proposed residential development, there will be many deliveries, including furniture movers, on the premises. These actions will take more than a fraction of time.

Noted, there are residential developments with no loading bay provisions. However, the provision of a designated loading bay will always support efficient usage. Considering the above reasoning, I am not in a position to support the non-compliance of the loading bay.

Based on AUP_ E27.8.2(7) assessment criteria, the non-compliance of E27.6.2(8) loading bay has been reviewed. Considering the large residential nature of the proposal, no safe loading bay arrangement can be noted on site apart from parking on JOAL - which blocks adjacent driveways. The loading bay would be utilised primarily for residential delivery type of customers including furniture movement. If no loading bay is available, users may park in an unsafe manner and create more obstructions. No existing on-street loading bay is noted in the vicinity of the site and it is illegal to park on the kerb side of JOAL [as per 2(c) of Schedule 5 to the Property Law Act 2007]. No specified location can be noted where informal or another site in the immediate vicinity can be utilised for a loading bay without breaking the law. Provision of a loading bay will be always necessary for a large community like Delmore, and the infringement cannot be acceptable from a traffic point of view.

3. Vehicle tracking – It is noted that the applicant prefers to re-check the vehicle tracking and required widening at the EPA stage. However, failed tracking will create ongoing maintenance,

safety issues and redesigning of light pole locations. Considering the above reasoning, I am not in a position to support the non-compliance of vehicle tracking.

Based on AUP_ E27.8.2(8) assessment criteria, the non-compliance of E27.6.3.3 vehicle tracking has been reviewed. Considering the large residential nature of proposal, generation of high vehicle volume based on partial completion of the project, high expected future pedestrian counts, speed management measures are not finalised, lighting pole locations are not finalised - where the vehicles may overlap with pole locations, damage to kerb/ grass berm/ utility poles will be an ongoing maintenance, the infringement cannot be acceptable from a traffic point of view.

6.0 Proposed Conditions

I recommend conditions to address the following:

1. Prior to the occupation of 670 dwellings within the development, the consent holder must ensure to monitor the Grand Drive/ SH1 interchange by a qualified Traffic Engineer to determine efficiency and safety. The report must be submitted to Auckland Council for further assessment and the required mitigation measures related to the effects of the development implemented.
2. Edits to Condition #147- Activemode connectivity part of Ara Hills development:

Prior to the occupation of any dwellings within the development ~~Stage 1A~~, the consent holder must design and construct a shared pedestrian and cycle pathway connecting to the Ara Hills development.
3. Additional points to Condition #111- Lighting Plan as referred in “Appendix 57_Proposed Conditions” as below:
c) The proposed light pole location is to be reviewed by the Auckland Council Traffic Engineer to ensure the pedestrian path and JOALs lighting locations are not creating any obstructions to vehicle tracking. If required, the traffic engineer can ask for additional vehicle tracking curves.
4. Requirement for a loading bay and associated assessment - Prior to the occupation of dwellings within the development, the consent holder must ensure to provide the minimum required loading bay at JOALs as per AUP_ Table E27.6.2.7.

7.0 Recommendation

The report discussed potential safety issues and traffic congestion due to the proposal, and there remains outstanding concerns.