



Stantec New Zealand
Level 3, 2 Hazeldean Road
Addington, Christchurch 8024
NEW ZEALAND
Mail to: PO Box 13052, Christchurch 8140

2 July 2026

Project No: 310206500

Incite
P O Box 2058
Wellington 6140

Attention: Torrey McDonnell

Dear Torrey

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

This letter has been prepared to inform the memorandum from the Applicant that responds to directions from the Panel Convener in Minute 3 (dated 27 May 2026) which requests further information relating to transport matters, specifically in respect of individual lot vehicle crossings, as part of their Fast Track application completeness review.

The relevant extract from the Council's assessment is provided below:

Transport	Insufficiently detailed	An <i>Integrated Transport Assessment</i> is provided at Appendix 14. Locations of vehicle crossings are not identified on the roading plans. This does not provide sufficient information for the resource consent sought under rule TR-R2 of the Porirua District Plan 2025 or an assessment of the effects.
-----------	-------------------------	---

In providing a response, the table below provides a detailed assessment of the relevant Transport Chapter standards as they relate to the design and layout of vehicle crossings, noting where potential non-compliances have been identified an assessment of any associated effects has been provided. The table should be read in conjunction with the attached Plan, which identifies key non-compliances on an individual lot basis.

Ref	Standard	Assessment
TR-S3 Design of Vehicle Access		
1.	The vehicle access must be designed to achieve the design speeds, minimum widths, maximum gradients and seal requirements in TR-Table 2. <i>Based on TR-Table 2, individual lot driveways are classified as a Vehicle Access Level 1, requiring the following:</i> - Maximum Gradient: 20% - Movement lane: 2.75-3m - Where an access rises to the	Individual Lot Driveways Will comply. Individual lot driveways can be designed to achieve a Level 1 formed width. Whilst details of internal driveway gradients for individual lots will be confirmed at next stage of design, a review of the building platform levels relative to the adjoining road carriageways indicates all driveways can be formed to achieve a maximum gradient of 20%.

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

Ref	Standard	Assessment
	<i>road, the maximum gradient must be 5% within 6m of the road boundary.</i>	Where driveways slope up towards the road, they will be designed to achieve a maximum gradient of 5%, to maintain adequate sightlines between drivers and pedestrians on adjoining footpaths (ensuring the vehicle bonnet does not obstruct the driver's field of view), supporting safe visibility at the site boundary. Again, review of the building platforms relative to the road levels confirms this can be achieved.
2.	Provision for turning in a common area must be designed in accordance with TR-Figure 1.	Does not apply. Not required for vehicle crossings serving individual residential lots.
3.	A Vehicle Access Level 4 must include streetlighting provided in accordance with the following: a. Streetlighting must be designed in accordance with NZ Transport Agency document M30 Specification and Guidelines for Road Lighting Design (2014); b. Streetlighting bulbs must be on the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency List of M30 Approved Luminaires. c. Streetlighting columns must comply with the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency M26:2012 and M26A:2017 Specification for Lighting Columns. d. Streetlighting columns in Private Ways Level 4 must be a minimum of 8m in height.	Does not apply. Not required for vehicle crossings serving individual residential lots.
4.	Pedestrian walkways, cycleways and shared paths in vehicle access areas must comply with the: Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Paths for Walking and Cycling (2017)	Does not apply. Not required for vehicle crossings serving individual residential lots.
TR-S5 Vehicle Crossings		
1.	The spacing of vehicle crossings along a road frontage must not be less than the dimensions in TR-Table 3. The number of vehicle crossings along any one road frontage must not exceed the number in TR-Table 4. • <70km/h Collector and Access roads = 1 per 25m • 0-16m frontage length = 1 vehicle crossing on Collector and Access roads	Will not comply. Given that many proposed lots have frontages of approximately 15m, achieving a ratio of 1 driveway per 25 m of road frontage is not feasible. It is unclear how this '1 driveway per 25m' requirement was determined, and TR-S5 provides no matters of discretion for developments that do not meet this standard. Whilst limiting driveway frequency can have traffic safety benefits, the standard is overly restrictive. The proposed driveway frequency of roughly one per 15 m is considered

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		appropriate for the site's intended land use, and aligns with established residential patterns in similar density developments in Pukerua Bay and the wider district. In this regard, a search of the accident record for those nearby streets of Gray Street, Muri Road and Sea Vista where established driveway ratios are similar to that proposed, indicates no history of crashes occurring in the last 10-years that can be attributed to conflict between traffic turning at driveways. This is not surprising considering the low traffic generation levels typical of residential driveways. With these examples of good safety records and with low residential driveway volumes, it is assessed that the spacing of vehicle crossings not fully achieving the standard will not lead to adverse safety outcomes.
2.	The length of a vehicle crossing parallel to the road must be no more than: i. 3m for Vehicle Access Level 1; ii. 6m for a Vehicle Access Level 2, 3 or 4; or iii. 9m if heavy vehicles are to be accommodated on the site.	Will not comply. The 3m maximum width is considered overly restrictive for the residential development of the form proposed. Given that a number of the proposed lots are anticipated to accommodate double garages, it is expected that associated vehicle crossings will be formed at widths generally in the order of 4.5 to 5.5m, consistent with typical residential design practice as is common throughout suburban areas in the District. In such environments, driveway traffic volumes are low, and the likelihood of simultaneous vehicle and pedestrian movements at the crossing infrequent. Accordingly, vehicle crossing widths of 4.5 to 5.5m are appropriate and consistent with typical residential subdivision design, and the associated departure from a 3m maximum is not assessed as giving rise to adverse safety or pedestrian amenity effects due to low traffic volumes and infrequent vehicle–pedestrian interactions.
3.	A vehicle crossing for a site with frontage to two or more roads must connect to the road with the lower road classification.	Will not Comply. For lots with frontage to more than one road, vehicle access will be taken from the lower order road in all instances, with the exception of 8 lots (298, 300, 351, 560, 573, 604, 745 and 928, noting these lots are identified on the attached Plan). In each of these cases, the Site topography results in the lot levels sitting either higher or lower (by between 1 and 4.5m) than the road level on the minor frontage street, making vehicle access from that street impracticable. The intent of the standard is interpreted to reduce side friction on higher order roads which have a predominant through-traffic function. In this instance, the collector roads in question already service a number of residential accesses on both the same and opposite sides of the road. Traffic generation associated with these seven additional

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		residential driveways on the respective collector road frontages will be low, at less than 1 vehicle movement an hour, and will not materially affect the function, capacity, or safety of these roads. It is also noted that the proposed access arrangements for these 8 lots allow the construction of driveways that achieve the required minimum sight distance standards (where such arrangements would not be fully achievable on the minor road frontage), ensuring safer vehicle ingress and egress.
4.	The minimum design vehicle used for a vehicle crossing must be a 5.2m x 1.94m vehicle (99th percentile vehicle).	Will comply. Individual lot driveways will be designed to accommodate a B99 vehicle.
5.	A vehicle crossing must not be located within 6m of an intersection tangent point as shown in TR-Figure 3. A Vehicle Access Level 1 is exempt from the exclusion in respect of the kerb section marked XY, with driveways needing to be located outside of the intersection tangent point.	Will not comply. Almost all individual driveways can achieve the separation distance from an intersection, with the exception of the 14 driveways serving lots #30, 247, 248, 272, 337, 341, 395, 543, 580, 756, 757, 781, 830, and 923 (these lots are identified on the attached Plan, noting a further 9 lots including #253, 273, 342, 396, 542, 550, 581, 657, 922, and 780 located adjacent to an intersection are identified as able to achieve compliance for the preferred driveway location). In the cases of non-compliance, localised constraints including changes in levels along the lot frontage relative to the street require driveways to be located opposite an intersection. It is noted this number is lower than previously indicated in the earlier compliance schedule, since it takes account of a reassessment of the clause where 'Level 1' driveways are not required to meet the 6m separation from the tangent point of the intersection, meaning fewer driveways are now non-compliant on this basis. The intent of this standard is to reduce overlapping turning movement conflicts between vehicles entering and exiting driveways and vehicles turning at intersections. It is noted that such arrangements involving low volume single residential lot driveways are not unusual, and indeed a number of such examples where driveways connect opposite side roads at tee-intersections can be seen nearby on Gray Street, Muri Road and Sea Vista Drive, without adversely impacting on their safe operation. A search of the accident record for these nearby streets along their length indicates no history of crashes occurring in the last 10-years that can be attributed to conflict between traffic turning at intersections and vehicles entering / exiting residential driveways. This is not surprising considering the low traffic generation levels typical of residential driveways. With these examples of good safety records and with low residential driveway

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		volumes, it is assessed that these vehicle crossings not fully achieving the minimum separation distances will not lead to adverse safety outcomes.
6.	A vehicle crossing must provide a clear visibility splay for pedestrian safety from 1.0m above ground level as shown in TR-Figure 2. Where two-way access is provided at the vehicle crossing, the visibility splay is only required on the side adjacent to the exiting vehicle.	Will comply. Individual driveway crossings will be designed to ensure suitable visibility splays are provided. An additional consent condition is recommended to ensure there are restrictions on boundary fencing arrangements and landscaping, to ensure sightline splays are not adversely impacted.
7.	The minimum sight distances at a vehicle crossing must be in accordance with TR-Table 5 and measured in accordance with TR-Figure 4. • 50km/h speed limit = 40m sight distance • 40km/h speed limit = 30m sight distance • 30km/h speed limit = 25m sight distance	Will not comply Whilst the posted speed limit of public roads within the Site will likely be 50km/h, a combination of the road geometry, gradients, and adopted road typologies will encourage lower operating speeds. At this stage, the precise location of all vehicle crossings has not been finalised, with lot-specific design typically coming later for developments of this scale. This is a common approach in vacant lot subdivisions as it provides design flexibility for future house designs. In the majority of cases, driveways will be located to achieve the required sight distance. However, it is acknowledged that in some instances, such as where lots are located in proximity to horizontal curves, cul-de-sac heads, or where topographical constraints apply, it may not be practicable to fully achieve the specified sightline requirements based on the posted speed limit. Such situations are typically associated with tighter road geometry, where operating speeds are inherently lower, noting such circumstances are not uncommon and in practice do not present safety risks given the moderated speed environment of the adjoining road, combined with the very low volume of vehicle movements at the driveways. An assessment of the ability for individual lot driveways within the Site to satisfy the 40m sight distance requirements for the 50km/h posted speed limit has been undertaken, as illustrated in the attached Plan using the following classifications: • Lot shown 'red': driveway will not meet the minimum requirement – irrespective of where it's located along the site boundary; • Lot shown 'orange': minimum requirement achievable for preferred driveway position, but non-compliance possible; and

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		Lot shown 'yellow': minimum requirement achievable. The assessment shows sight distance non-compliance is most likely where lots either access on the inside of a low radius bend that involves a change in angle of 45-degrees or more, or where accessing onto a cul-de-sac head. At these locations the road geometry or turning head (in the case of cul-de-sacs) will trigger a reduced operating speed. As a result, the actual operating speed will be well below 50km/h, and the corresponding safe sight distance can be assessed using lower speed criteria. Guidance on appropriate corresponding sight distances in these cases can be taken from the values in TR-Table 5 for 40km/h and 30km/h speed environments, and from the Austroads guidance for 'Stopping Sight Distances' (SSD) with a 1.5 second reaction time (which align closely with the District Plan TR-Table 5) where lower speeds will result from tighter road geometry or narrower carriageways (including on the proposed private JOALs). The design operating speed of the bend therefore represents the appropriate parameter for assessment of a safe sight distance, and a consent condition is recommended (as an amended version of the Substantive Application Condition #31 in Appendix 7) requiring assessment of driveways where compliance with the standard is not fully met. As identified in the attached Plan, with the exception of lots connecting onto cul-de-sac heads where vehicle speed will be very low, all instances of non-compliance occur on local roads where vehicle crossings are located on the inside of a bend of 45-degrees or more. In such cases assessment of the vehicle crossing location against the SSD will be undertaken based on the anticipated operating speed of the bend. This assessment would most appropriately be undertaken at engineering approval stage where any necessary design measures can be considered to manage vehicle speeds and / or adjust driveway placement.
8.	A vehicle crossing must not be located within 30m of a railway crossing, measured from the nearest edge of the vehicle crossing to the nearest railway track.	Does not apply. There are no railway crossings within 30m of the Site.
9.	A vehicle crossing located within a Rural Zone must be formed in accordance with TR-Figure 5.	Does not apply. The development area extent within the Site is zoned a mixture of Medium Density Residential Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone.

Ref	Standard	Assessment
10.	A vehicle crossing that crosses a footpath, cycleway or shared path must not exceed a crossfall gradient of 2.5%.	Will comply The road berms, footpaths and shared paths across the Site have been designed to a 2% crossfall, and all driveways will be designed to tie-in with this gradient.
11.	There must be a minimum separation of 2m along the footpath between crossings serving adjacent sites. Where two crossings on adjacent sites can be combined and the combined crossings do not exceed a total width of 6m at the boundary, no minimum separation distance will apply.	Will not comply. The majority of lots across the site will comply with the minimum 2m separation between adjacent vehicle crossings. A small number of lots located at the heads of cul-de-sacs, where frontage widths reduce as a consequence of lot geometry, will instead be served by combined vehicle crossings. In these instances, the total crossing width will exceed 6m. The purpose of the standard is interpreted as avoiding the formation of over-wide vehicle crossings which can adversely affect pedestrian amenity by increasing the extent of potential conflict areas along footpaths (consistent with the purpose of related standards such as TR-S5.2 above). In this case, the combined crossings are limited to cul-de-sac environments, where traffic volumes are low and vehicle speeds are inherently constrained by the no-exit road layout. As such, the likelihood of simultaneous pedestrian and vehicle movements at these crossings is low. Accordingly, the limited departures from the 6m maximum combined vehicle crossing width are not assessed as giving rise to adverse safety or amenity effects.
TR-S6 Design of on-site car parking spaces		
1.	Where provided on a site, car parking spaces must: a. Comply with the minimum dimensions of TR-Table 6; b. Have a maximum gradient of: i. 5% (1 vertical to 20 horizontal) for surfaces parallel to the angle of parking for non-residential activities; ii. 10% (1 vertical to 10 horizontal) for surfaces parallel to the angle of parking for residential activities; and iii. 6.25% (1 vertical to 16 horizontal) for surfaces at any other direction to the angle of parking.	Will comply. Where driveways and garages are provided on individual lots, associated car parking spaces will be designed to meet the minimum dimensions specified in TR-Table 6.
		Will comply Given the individual residential lot nature of the development, driveways are required to satisfy the maximum 10% grade. The purpose of identifying a maximum gradient within parking modules is to ensure a level of convenience for those entering / exiting vehicles and to enable the safe opening of doors (without them closing on their own - as can be the case on steep grades). Review of the lot levels shows all on-site car parks can be designed to satisfy the 10% maximum grade.

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

Ref	Standard	Assessment
	c. Have a minimum height clearance of 2.3m	Will comply. All residential garages will include a minimum 2.3m clear height.
2.	For any blind aisle, the aisle must extend 1m beyond the last parking space the aisle provides access to.	Does not apply. No off-street carpark (other than driveways serving individual residential lots) are included in this application.

As shown, assessment of the individual lot vehicle crossings indicates some departures from TR-S5.

Following further engagement with Council on an appropriate strategy for assessment of individual lot vehicle crossings against the District Plan standards, an amended draft Condition #31 'vehicle crossings' has been developed to provide a more structured approach in determining compliance or alignment with the intent of the standards, as follows:

Condition 31

Individual lot vehicle crossings shall be designed to be in accordance with the standards included under TR-S5 of the Porirua District Plan. Where full compliance is not achieved, vehicle crossings will either be designed to incorporate any appropriate mitigations or be subject to specific assessment by a suitably qualified traffic engineer, as follows:

- a. vehicle crossings shall be designed to a maximum 5.5m width to allow for access to a double garage or associated driveway, where the formation width under TR-S5.2 cannot be complied with;*
- b. vehicle crossings shall be located so as to maximise separation as far as practicable where separation distances under TR-S5.5 cannot be complied with;*
- c. consent notices shall be placed on lots placing restrictions on boundary fencing arrangements and landscaping, to ensure sightline splay are not adversely impacted where TR-S5.6 cannot be complied with; and*
- d. where vehicle crossing sightlines under TR-S5.7 cannot be complied with and the crossing is located on the inside of a bend with a change of angle of 45 degrees or more, an assessment shall be undertaken of the associated Austroads Stopping Sight Distance (with a reaction time of 1.5 seconds) for the estimated operating speed of the road where the vehicle crossing connects. The traffic engineer shall confirm that non-compliance with the Council standard will not result in unacceptable safety effects.*

Details of the wording of this revised condition can be further developed with Council to assist the Panel.

2 July 2026

Attention: Torrey McDonnell

Page 9 of 9

Reference: Mt Welcome – Response to Council Comments on Transport Matters

We trust the above assessment provides the necessary clarification on the associated transport matters related to the request for additional information on individual lot driveways.

Yours sincerely


Stantec New Zealand

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jamie Whittaker', is written over a thin red horizontal line.

Jamie Whittaker

Principal Transportation Planner

Enclosed: Vehicle Driveway Location Compliance Assessment Plan



LEGEND:

- PREFERABLE VEHICLE CROSSING LOCATION WILL NOT COMPLY WITH TR-S5.3
- PREFERABLE VEHICLE CROSSING LOCATION WILL NOT COMPLY WITH TR-S5.5
- COMPLIANCE WITH TR-S5.5 ACHIEVABLE FOR PREFERABLE VEHICLE CROSSING LOCATION, BUT NON COMPLIANCE POSSIBLE
- PREFERABLE VEHICLE CROSSING LOCATION WILL NOT COMPLY WITH TR-S5.7
- COMPLIANCE WITH TR-S5.7 ACHIEVABLE FOR PREFERABLE VEHICLE CROSSING LOCATION, BUT NON COMPLIANCE POSSIBLE
- COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS TR-S5.3, TR-S5.5 & TR-S5.7 ACHIEVABLE

This design and drawing shall only be used for the purpose for which it was supplied and shall not be altered or reproduced without the permission of Envelope Engineering Limited. No liability shall be accepted for unauthorised use of this design and drawing.

REVISIONS:			
REV	NOTES	BY	DATE
R1	RESOURCE CONSENT ISSUE	LB	06-03-2026
R2	FOR RESOURCE CONSENT	PWJ	01-07-2026

PROJECT:
PUKERUA PROPERTY GROUP LP
MT WELCOME - PUKERUA BAY
PORIRUA

TITLE:
RPOPOSED ROAD DRIVEWAYS
OVERALL LAYOUT



DESIGNED: PWJ	DRAWN: LB	REVISION:
CHECKED: PWJ	PLOT DATE: 01-07-2026	
SCALE A1: 1:2500	SCALE A3: 1:5000	
STATUS: RESOURCE CONSENT		
PROJECT No: 1753-02	DRAWING No: 3600	R2