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

4 June 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 *Integrated Transport Assessment* 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. Where potential non-compliances have been identified, an assessment of any associated effects has been provided.

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. *Based on TR-Table 2, individual lot driveways are classified as a Vehicle Access Level 1, requiring the following:* • *Maximum Gradient: 20%* • *Movement lane: 2.75-3m* • *Where an access rises to the road, the maximum gradient must be 5% within 6m of the road boundary.*	**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%. 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

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		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. • <70m 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 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.

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		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 7 lots (298, 300, 351, 560, 573, 604 and 928). 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 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.

Ref	Standard	Assessment
		It is also noted that the proposed access arrangements for these 7 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. In these cases, 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 volumes, it is assessed that these 14 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	**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

Ref	Standard	Assessment
	visibility splay is only required on the side adjacent to the exiting vehicle.	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 within the Site will likely be 50km/h, a combination of the road geometry, gradients, and adopted road typologies will encourage lower operating speeds in the order of 40km/h. 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, intersections, 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. In such cases a consent condition is recommended (and has been included in the Substantive Application as Condition 31 in Appendix 7) requiring driveways where compliance with the standard is not fully met to be located to maximise sightlines. Some amendments to Condition 31 are recommended as outlined below the table.
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.
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	**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

Ref	Standard	Assessment
	combined crossings do not exceed a total width of 6m at the boundary, no minimum separation distance will apply.	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;	**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.
	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** 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.
	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 carparks (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.

The current proposed consent condition #31 'vehicle crossings' requires separation from intersections to be 'maximised' where full compliance is not achieved. It is noted this could be further refined to capture a more holistic response to design departures 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 practicable. Where full compliance is not practicable, vehicle crossings will be designed to incorporate any appropriate mitigations including:

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. *vehicle crossings shall be located so as to maximise sightlines as far as practicable where driveway sightlines under TR-S5.7 cannot be complied with; and*
d. *consent notices shall be placed on lots placing restrictions on boundary fencing arrangements and landscaping, to ensure sightline splays are not adversely impacted where TR-S5.6 cannot be complied with.*

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

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

Jamie Whittaker
Principal Transportation Planner