

188 Beaumont Street Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure 20A:

Traffic Engineering Addendum

Michael Kwok

17 July 2026

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name: 188 Beaumont Street

Fast-Track application number: EPA: FTAA- 2604-1205
Council: BUN60464683

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Traffic Engineer Addendum Memo

To: Lewis So– Lead Planner
Russell Butchers – Principal Project Lead

From: Michael Kwok – Senior Traffic Engineer

Qualifications
& Relevant
Experience:

I hold a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Auckland, which I obtained in 2018.
I have seven years of experience in traffic engineering, transportation planning, and road safety.
I am a member of Engineering New Zealand.
I have prepared expert evidence and technical assessments for resource consent applications and fast-track applications and have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities on multiple occasions.

Preparation in
Accordance
with the Code
of Conduct:

I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Signature:



Date:

17 July 2026

3.0 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed in preparing this memorandum:

- Transport Memorandum - 188 Beaumont Street Section 67 Traffic Response dated 14 July 2026
- 188 Beaumont St - S67 Response Tracking Table - Partial Response 3 dated 14 July 2026.

4.0 Specialist Assessment

Honwin Shen was responsible for the original transport assessment review of the application and prepared a memo dated 23 June 2026. Due to his absence at the time the additional information was received, I was requested to review and respond to the matters raised on his behalf.

The scope of my review was limited to further information responses relating to the parking layout, bicycle parking, and loading space arrangements.

4.1. Parking layout

The applicant's latest response includes B85 vehicle tracking curves and dimensions for the proposed car parking spaces. I have reviewed this information and consider the proposed vehicle manoeuvring and parking layout to be workable.

4.2. Bicycle parking spaces

It is noted that Mr Shen's original assessment concluded that there was a shortfall of 92 bicycle parking spaces, comprising 12 visitor spaces and 80 secure long-stay spaces.

4.2.1. Access to bicycle parking spaces

I have reviewed the applicant's latest response, which provides further details regarding the ramp and confirms that bicycles can be transported within lifts. On this basis, I consider the proposed bicycle access arrangements to be acceptable.

4.2.2. Long stay bicycle parking rate

The applicant's latest response confirms that the required secure long-stay bicycle parking spaces are proposed to be accommodated within individual dwellings and that bicycles can be transported via the building lifts. As the AUP expressly provides for secure long-stay bicycle parking to be located within dwellings, I am satisfied that the proposal addresses the transport-related aspects of this matter. I defer to Urban Design's assessment as to whether the location and integration of these spaces may adversely affect the amenity or functionality of the dwellings.

4.2.3. Visitor bicycle parking rate

The applicant's latest response does not appear to address the identified shortfall in visitor bicycle parking. As such, the shortfall remains. I therefore agree with Mr Shen's recommendation that sufficient visitor bicycle parking be provided to meet the relevant AUP requirements.

4.3. Loading space arrangements

Mr Shen's original assessment recommended that a minimum of three loading spaces be provided, comprising two standard loading spaces and one small loading space, and noted that the submitted truck tracking diagrams were not workable as a truck required the use of two loading spaces for manoeuvring.

The applicant's latest response does not include revised truck tracking diagrams demonstrating that heavy vehicles can manoeuvre independently within the loading area. While the applicant has provided a justification for retaining two loading spaces and considers this sufficient to meet the expected servicing demand of the development, the proposal continues to provide fewer than the three loading spaces recommended in Mr Shen's assessment.

Accordingly, I agree with Mr Shen's original recommendation that a minimum of three loading spaces be provided to adequately accommodate the loading and servicing activities associated with the development.

4 Recommendation

From a traffic engineering perspective, the application cannot be supported in its current form. Although further information has been provided, concerns remain regarding the proposed loading and bicycle parking arrangements.