
Joint Witness Statement Transportation

Sunfield [FTAA-2503-1039]

19 November 2025

Facilitated by: Dave Serjeant, Planner and Independent Planning Commissioner

Recorded by: Nick Freeman, Planner, Tattico

Attendance

The list of participants for this expert conferencing is included in the schedule at the end of this Statement.

Basis of Attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2023

All participants agree to the following:

- (a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2023 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session;
- (b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023.

Matters Considered at Conferencing – Agenda and Outcomes

A. Integration with Ardmore Airport Stage 3

Context; Ardmore Airport Stage 9 proposes a roundabout intersection upgrade at Mill Road – Hamlin Road (current location); Sunfield development - . Proposes realignment of the intersection to Mill Road – Walters Road – Hamlin Road (realigned) with a signalised intersection;

The questions on this topic (Topic A) are to be addressed unless they have been resolved prior to the conference and confirmation of any such resolution having been provided to the Expert Panel;

- a. Can the timing and sequencing relating to the implementation of resource consents be addressed?

Response: LH noted there have been discussions last week between the applicant and Ardmore airport. A joint statement was produced Friday 14th November.

- b. Has the applicant reached a conclusion in terms of how the proposal affects current and future access to Ardmore airport from Walters Road prior to Mill Road Stage 2 being constructed?

Response: LH noted the joint statement (item 1). Ardmore Airport and the applicant are working on a proposed condition to address timing and integration of the respective developments and the Hamlin Road and Cosgrave Road intersection.

B. Autonomous Sunbus

- a. What is the Sunbus operating model (public vs private)?

Response: LH understands the Sunbus operating model is proposed to be a private operating model. LH also understands, the applicant is willing to work with AT through the development of the Implementation Plan to incorporate and coordinate public transport within Sunfield and the Takanini / Papakura AT network.

All experts note that the modelling findings are reliant on the assumption that frequent public transport service will be provided as proposed.

- b. Will / should the Sunbus serve all bus stops on routes to Takanini and Papakura Train Stations?

Response: LH understands that at this point in time, it is not proposed that the Sunbus will stop at all bus stops between Sunfield and the Takanini and Papakura Train Stations as it will be a private service. LH understands the applicant is open to options in future with AT.

SV notes there will be other users that will benefit from bus stops on route from Sunfields to the station. If not, there will be more trips using private vehicles. Also noting that the details of other bus stops between Sunfields and other stations defined by the Public Transport (Sunbus) Operational and Implementation Plan (PTOIP).

- c. Would the operation of the Sunbus impact on roading space for other public services?

Response: LH does not believe this to be the case (especially in the short term) and notes that this can be coordinated through the development of the Implementation Plan.

SV notes that the assessment of bus capacity needs to be confirmed for the bus stops that Sunbus will serve.

MP & CR notes that the additional buses operating along the existing roads, may require additional infrastructure (such as priority lanes) to avoid increased congestion and to facilitate the level of frequency and reliability required for the Sunbus.

- d. What level of coverage does the Sunbus provide for the industrial precinct?

Response: LH considers that the Sunbus provides the industrial precinct with an adequate level of coverage especially given the reduction in industrial land as a result of the Mill Road Stage 2a NoR.

MP & CR notes that there needs to be sufficient permeability through the industrial precinct for pedestrians to connect to the proposed Sunbus and stops.

SV & MP notes that 'sufficient permeability' should be defined by no more than 400m walk distance from the bus stop to avoid people from using private vehicles to access the industrial precinct.

- e. What is the appropriate trigger for the Sunbus service? Eg should it be based on dwellings occupied or constructed?

Response: LH considers the appropriate trigger for the Sunbus service is 445 dwellings occupied but is open to amending this.

All experts support this statement.

- f. Are there appropriate contingency / monitoring provisions to provide certainty on continuity / level of service?

Response: SV notes that at the time the 1350 dwellings are occupied a 10-minute frequency of the Sunbus is triggered. How does the applicant ensure that as development grows, the frequency of the Sunbus increase? (What incentives are in place to ensure growth and high public transport mode share?)

LH notes that currently the conditions do not have any specific review of public transport mode share after the 1350 dwellings are occupied.

MP & CR support the consideration of additional monitoring beyond 1350 as development progresses.

SV notes there is a risk that Sunbus is not attractive to be operated in a private model and needs to be operated by AT and that AT does not have sufficient funds to provide the required public transport service levels. SV would like more triggers beyond 1350 dwellings occupied and other areas that still can be developed.

JP considers that the triggers should include all land uses.

- g. Is there any evidence from developments (NZ or internationally) to determine whether the high public transport mode share proposed for the Sunfield development has been successfully achieved elsewhere?

Response: As per the ITA, LH recognises this this development is essentially a first for New Zealand and as such there are no NZ examples. LH is however aware of examples of car-less society developments in USA, Germany and Netherlands. LH notes the recent revised modelling (3,000vph scenario) has less reliance on the high PT share.

SV notes that Sunbus will provide access to and from the stations, but it will not provide access to all other desired origin / destinations such as employment centres and hospitals etc. This is a risk of not achieving high enough PT mode share.

LH recognises the above statement, and notes that this uncertainty is one of the main reasons the 3000vph scenario has been tested and the additional condition at 1350 dwellings occupied has been included (to test mode share and potential mitigation in the form of intersection upgrades and/or public transport improvements).

MP & CR notes that in regard to intersection capacity, sensitivity testing has considered available capacity beyond the 3000vph scenario.

- h. Confirmation of the regulatory approvals already obtained to run the Sun buses on public roads, and details of any other regulatory approvals (if any) that will be required?

Response: LH understands the proposed Ohmio bus service has NZTA level 4 approval and can be licensed to operate on New Zealand roads which allows for connection of the service outside of the Sunfield development. A further consent is required from NZTA relating to the specific route and operation. LH notes, that in the event that the required regulatory approvals for the autonomous vehicle cannot be gained, then a 'traditional' bus could just as easily be used as the Sunbus.

- i. Are upgrades required to the public transport nodes (e.g. to address capacity constraints) and, if so, how will these be facilitated?

Response: LH notes the Commute response titled 'Sunfield – Sensitivity Testing / Staging' dated 12 November 2025 attached.

SV notes that current capacity at Papakura interchange is used up as buses are linked to train arrivals and it's not possible to add the additional demand required to accommodate Sunbus trips. AT is considering expanding Papakura interchange to accommodate public transport service enhancements for the growing areas in South Auckland such as Drury. Sunbus stops should be separate from AT stops as it is a privately operated service or an exemption needs to be sought with AT to allow access. The interchange capacity is key enabling factor for Sunbus it is therefore needs to be addressed in sufficient detail e.g. drawings with proposed location for Sunbus stops prior to approving the development.

LH notes the above and will discuss this issue with SV offline over the next few days.

- j. Given the likely number of bus movements, will a bus lane be required along local roads between the site and the stations. Is there enough width in the road reserve to accommodate this?

Response: LH considers that dedicated bus lanes are not required between the site and the stations. He does however note that these buses could use future planned routes e.g. Porchester FTN noting that there will be a gradual uptake in PT for the site.

MP & CR note that some form of bus priority will be required between the site and the station in order to achieve the required level of service for the PT mode share. Condition 123A should include both roads capacity upgrades and PT service priority upgrades as potential mitigation and should be considered alongside the PT planning required in condition 114. LH agrees with this approach.

C. Road Design / Active Modes

- a. Has it been demonstrated that all roads to vest will be designed to Auckland Transport's standards?

Response: LH notes that the intention is all roads to vest will be designed to AT standards.

MP & CR & LH note that the design will go through engineering plan approval which will confirm design compliance with AT standards.

MP & CR & LH note the loop road which includes the busway is to be redesigned with traditional kerb-side bus lanes. This can be done prior to resource consent approval or secured by way of condition that the design is updated at engineering approval stage.

- b. Can the design of roads and laneways be finalised through conditions of consent?

Response: MP & CR note the response to (a) above but note that there is the need for flexibility to adjust lot boundaries if necessary to accommodate specific designs of intersections or road links.

- c. What active mode facilities are provided beyond the site to connect to the site to the wider transport network?

Response: LH notes the Commute response titled 'Sunfield – Sensitivity Testing / Staging' dated 12 November 2025 attached (section 2.3).

CR & MP (with reference to Figure 2) consider that the connection 1b and 2 should ideally be provided in order to provide a connection to the industrial employment areas and connection to 1a. They recognise the constraints in providing 1b for a separated cycle facility. They consider that a lower standard of facility may potentially be appropriate given the physical constraints of providing a separated facility.

- d. What legal mechanisms (e.g., easements, vesting, consent notices) will be implemented to guarantee that internal walking and cycling linkages between neighbourhoods, roads, and parks remain publicly accessible in perpetuity?

Response: LH considers this to be more of a planning / legal question but notes all the above (e.g. easements, vesting, consent notices), are available.

- e. How will interim intersection or road layouts be managed (including future proofing and allocating accountability as to who is responsible for future upgrades) to ensure that they can be upgraded to the final design?

Response: All experts understand that the interim intersections and road layouts relate to the intersection along the loop road and the particularly the intersections either side of the 'missing link'.

LH notes that the internal loop intersections should be constructed to their final layout. There may be the need to undertake minor alterations within road reserve when the 'missing link' is developed. This should be the responsibility of the 'missing link' applicant.

f. How will the provision of active modes and public transport be staged to align with the staging of the development?

Response: LH notes the Commute response titled ‘Sunfield – Sensitivity Testing / Staging’ dated 12 November 2025 attached (section 2.3) for both active modes and PT staging.

All experts agree that the staging in the conditions needs to consider 1b and 2. To allow for PT to operate throughout the staging of the development until its completion, facilities (turning facilities, bus stops) within the site are needed.

g. Is it intended that laneways will function as informal recreational and trafficable spaces, meeting FENZ access standards for safety?

Response: All experts consider this to be more of an urban design question but note that in terms of traffic engineering, all laneways will meet FENZ standards.

h. Do the vehicle movements associated with the temporary car parks during early stages allow the laneways to be used as informal recreation spaces?

Response: LH notes that the temporary carpark areas are generally near public roads and do not add traffic to the majority of the laneways. There will be a small number of laneways that will have additional traffic on part of them which, in the short term, will make informal recreation more difficult.

As a general principle, informal recreation on laneways with the temporary carparks has safety implications but it is noted that an urban design expert would also need to comment.

D. Traffic modelling and Trip Generation

a. Is the traffic modelling (undertaken by the Auckland Forecasting Centre at the request of Auckland Transport and NZTA and adopted by the Applicant), with associated conditions, appropriate?

Response: LH notes this is discussed in the 12 November 2025 letter. LH considers the AFC modelling (3,000vph external trips) scenario to be appropriate for a more “standard” development on the site and would not typically account for the “car-less” society proposed. As such he considers it to be more of an upper-level test in terms of traffic generation.

CR notes the AFC traffic modelling is appropriate for identifying potential effects of the development if the low trip rate estimated in the ITA is not achieved, and mitigation.

- b. Has updated traffic modelling been provided to account for changes to internal/external road connections as discussed with AT? Does this modelling reflect the removal of the busway and associated road design changes?

Response: LH notes that while the separated “busway” is no longer proposed, it will be replaced by more traditional kerbside bus lanes which still provide priority to buses. LH considers the modelling does not need to be adjusted for this change.

The modelling in the ‘12 November 2025 letter’ does take into account the external road connection changes (e.g. Airfield Road only having one access and Road 4 / Cosgrave Road being priority controlled).

MP & CR accept the updated modelling has been discussed but are yet to formally review to model files. LH to provide.

- c. Sensitivity testing and trip generation robustness:
 - i. Is sensitivity testing required for key intersections to demonstrate the robustness of the assumed 3,000 peak-hour trip generation rate and to clarify whether additional upgrades would be required if trip rates exceed this assumption?

Response: LH notes the Commute response titled ‘Sunfield – Sensitivity Testing / Staging’ dated 12 November 2025 attached provides commentary in this regard.

MP & CR & JP consider the wider intersections are also key intersections. LH has agreed to provide further information to inform the drafting of conditions on these intersections.

- ii. Is there justification for the 2,845- dwelling trigger for the Mill Rd/Airfield Rd upgrade to confirm whether SIDRA modelling reflects the 3,000 vph trip rate with acceptable intersection performance?

Response: LH notes the Commute response titled ‘Sunfield – Sensitivity Testing / Staging’ dated 12 November 2025 attached provides commentary in this regard. LH comments that upon review, the trigger for this intersection upgrade has been brought forward from 2,845 to 320 dwellings occupied (essentially 1st stage).

All experts accept the change of trigger to 320 dwellings occupied.

- d. Are the proposed intersection / transport upgrades appropriate?

Response: LH considers they are, providing the review condition after one third of the development takes place (currently proposed condition 123A) is included which considers the actual measured traffic generation together with progress on external projects (e.g. Mill Road).

CR & MP have reviewed the Commute Memo 12 November that sets out updated mitigation measures and triggers. They also note that mitigation could include PT, walking, cycling, and parking restrictions other than just roading upgrades.

- e. Are the proposed review conditions sufficiently robust to ensure that appropriate measures are implemented to address or mitigate the effects of the trip generation exceeding the envisaged trip generation rate?

Response: JP & CR & MP would like to see objective traffic measures in the 123A condition including industrial/employment trip generation triggers and achieving no worse than level of service 'E' based on delay and no worse than 0.95 degree of saturation.

LH generally agrees and will look to discuss with planners to alter consent conditions to reflect this.

E. Construction traffic / pavement impacts

- a. How will the anticipated damage to existing rural road pavements caused by heavy construction and earthwork traffic be mitigated, and what mechanisms will ensure these costs are not borne by Auckland Transport?
- b. Do the proposed conditions (20 and 21) appropriately address the measurable potential impacts of Sunfield construction traffic on the existing road network?
- c. If not, what additional matters need to be controlled (addressing on-site and off-site issues separately)?

Response (a-c): LH notes that in this case the most direct access is via an arterial road (Mill Road / Cosgrave Road) which is anticipated to carry heavy vehicles.

MP & LH acknowledge that proposed condition 21 requires additional consideration of the potential for damage to arterial/rural road pavements which will be used to access the site and the need for remediation by the developer.

F. Management / Parking enforcement

- a. Does the proposal, including associated conditions, appropriately control the parking of private vehicles?

Response: LH considers it does (with conditions). LH does however consider a condition monitoring the extent of any potential parking spillover into surrounding neighbourhoods (as per ITA) would be appropriate (as per Brett Harries' proposed condition 112C paragraph 107).

CR & MP & JP consider there is a potential effect of development parking in the surrounding area that we/applicant currently do not have mitigation for and there is a risk of impact to existing residents' safety and efficiency. They also note that the overspill into private roads can also be an issue.

JP & CR & MP consider a maximum parking condition is needed for the employment areas to avoid significant adverse impacts. Noting the 'transportation' peer review included recommendations for maximum parking rates in the employment area.

- b. Can illegal car parking be sufficiently managed without reliance on AT enforcement?

Response: All experts question to what extent illegal parking on a public road can be managed without some reliance on AT enforcement.

LH considers illegal parking in private area will need to be managed by body corporate or similar. In terms of illegal parking generally (public or private) this can be controlled through the use of design / planting that makes illegal parking difficult.

To the extent that there is an increase in off-site parking all experts consider that Brett Harries' proposed condition 112C paragraph 107 is generally appropriate.

- c. What limits will be placed on the quantum of parking in the proposed temporary parking areas and what will trigger their removal?

Response: LH considers the implementation of the regular Sunbus service (or similar) should be a trigger to start removing the parking.

All experts agree that there needs to be a condition around the quantum of temporary parking provided and its ultimate removal.

d. Is the proposed Travel Demand Management Plan (TDMP) for the Employment Precinct and Town Centre, and proposed condition, appropriate?

e. Should the residential precincts also be included in the TDMP?

Response (d & e): CR & MP consider that the TDMP should consider the whole site and should identify measures appropriate individual land uses within the site as necessary to achieve low vehicle trips. The TDMP should include targets and monitoring against those targets.

LH agrees to review the condition.

Confirmed in person: 19 November 2025

Expert's name and expertise	Party	Expert's confirmation
Leo Hills (LH)	Sunfield	Yes
Martin Peake (MP)	Auckland Council	Yes
Craig Richards (CR)	Auckland Council	Yes
Saul Vingrys (SV)	Auckland Council	Yes
John Parlane (JP)	897 Alpha Ltd	Yes

Observers: Ian Smallburn (Planner, Sunfield) and Karl Anderson (Planner, Auckland Council)

Note: Auckland Council as a Party includes all constituents of the Auckland Council 'family' of organisations.