

Delmore Fast-Track

25/06/2025 – Auckland Council Response

Annexure 19:

Transport (Auckland Council)

Philips Augustine

Memorandum – Specialist input: Traffic

To: Carly Hinde – Premium Unit
Dylan Pope – Consultant Planner

From: Philips Augustine, Traffic Engineer, Auckland Council

Date: 19 June 2025

This memorandum provides traffic comments on the Delmore fast-track approval application (**Application**).

I note that Auckland Transport has also provided detailed comments on the Application. This memorandum should be read in conjunction with Auckland Transport's comments.

Documents Reviewed: Specialist comments response by Commute_ 12-06-25, Integrated Transportation Assessment Report by Commute_ 13-02-25, AEE by B&A_ 17-02-25, associated plans, multiple updates & correspondence from applicants.

List all associated reasons for consent:

- E24.4.1, E27.6.3.7 - Non-compliance - Lighting design to be provided upfront. No lighting design has been received as at the date of writing
- E27.4.1 - Restricted discretionary activity - A2, A3, A5
- E27.6.1 - Non-compliance - Proposed development consists of >100 dwellings, trip generation - peak hr traffic will be >100v/h
- E27.6.2(8), E27.6.3.1, E27.6.3.2, E27.6.3.3 - Non-compliance - Loading Bay required for any activities >5000m² GFA except rural zones. The proposal is a future residential area in the future urban zone and is designed according to the urban environment
- E27.6.3.2(A) - Non-compliance - No separate accessible parking provided. This provision is required under the Decisions Version of Plan Change 79 (**PC79DV**)
- E27.6.3.3 - Non-compliance - Access and Manoeuvring - The proposed vehicle tracking (heavy vehicles) overlaps with kerb build-out at intersections
- E27.6.3.4, E27.6.4.1 - Non-compliance - Vehicle access restriction applied, 73 vehicle crossings gain access to a road within 10m of an intersection. Vehicles will need to reverse into the road frontage
- E27.6.4.2 - Non-compliance - A 2.0m separation between vehicle crossings is not achieved and minimum vehicle crossing width is not achieved at some dwellings
- E27.6.4.3 - Non-compliance - Speed management details & spacing not provided.

Overall Summary:

The proposal is to construct 1250 dwellings with 27 roads as part of a residential development at 88, 130, 132 Upper Orewa Road and 53A, 53B and 55 Russell Road, Orewa. The development also consists of one unserved residential super lot, open space areas, areas of protected vegetation, roads including part of the NoR 6 road, supporting infrastructure and other associated works. Works will be undertaken in two primary stages.

Once completed, the development is intended to be called Delmore. The site consists of 109ha and is currently titled under the future urban zone. Both Upper Orewa Road & Russell Road are classified as arterial roads. However, Grand Drive is classified as an arterial road under the AUP.

The following points are highlighted from a traffic safety point of view:

1. Traffic calming/ speed management measures

-The applicant has confirmed that the proposal will follow PC79DV requirements, and has agreed to add this as a condition. This is considered acceptable.

2. Sidra modelling to be further assessed

The initial modelling shows existing LOS A to proposed LOS F with queuing effect of >600.0m in multiple locations and timings. The applicant has further assessed the Sidra modelling and stated the LOS changed from F to C, with queuing reduced from 680m to 230m. However, no Sidra data has been provided. I am not in a position to endorse the intersection/ interchange effects based on the information provided. Further details from the applicant are required.

3. The spacing between the garage door and the property boundary (for secondary parking)

I have recommended 5.5m or a minimum of 5.0m to avoid any Pedestrian Access overlap.

The applicant has confirmed that 5.2/ 6.1m/ 6.9m will be maintained between the garage door and property boundary. This is considered acceptable.

4. Safety issues regarding the pedestrian access/ pedestrian path due to a high gradient

The applicant has confirmed that there are sections of local roads that exceed an 8% gradient. The applicant agreed to add a condition that will be added requiring high friction finishes on the concrete footpaths with gradients steeper than 8%. This is considered 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. It is important to provide safe and efficient active mode connectivity from the proposed site to the wider neighbourhood, especially the nearby town centre. Without this, the vehicle volume and associated queuing effect will be high during peak times. I recommend a condition be added to ensure the active mode path is constructed before the residential dwellings are occupied.

6. Confirmation of the vehicle crossing width

The applicant has confirmed that individual vehicle crossings will be 2.75m wide. This is considered acceptable.

7. Infringement of requirement for 4.0m length with a 5.0% gradient platform

Section 9.4.2 of the ITA notes that rule E27.6.4.4.1 requires that all vehicle accesses be designed so that where the access adjoins the road there is sufficient space on-site for a platform to enable vehicles to stop safely and check for pedestrians and other vehicles prior to exiting, and that the platform must have a maximum gradient no steeper than 1 in 20 (5%) and a minimum length of 4m. Figures 45 and 46 identify that multiple dwellings will be non-compliant. 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. This is considered acceptable.

8. Loading bay provision - no loading bays provided in the design

The applicant confirmed that no loading bays will be provided in the JOAL or anywhere as part of the proposal. The assessment has been reviewed, however, I am not in a position to support this considering that in the majority of locations, parking of heavy vehicles will block the vehicle crossing of the adjacent lot (and noting the effect of clause 2(c) of Schedule 5 to the Property Law Act 2007).

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 to be provided upfront

No lighting design has been provided. As per E27.6.3.7(1) of the AUP, lighting is to be provided where there are 10 or more parking spaces that are likely to be used during the hours of darkness. The parking and manoeuvring areas and associated pedestrian routes must be adequately lit during use in a manner that complies with the rules in Section E24 Lighting. A lighting design should be submitted upfront, considering this is a large-scale residential development and given the high vehicle rates. As per the Applicant's submitted design, vehicle tracking is already overlapping with kerb build-outs, and if the lighting is not designed in a workable location, both design elements will clash and will be an ongoing safety and maintenance issue. The Applicant stated that the lighting design will be provided by 19 June. However, no design has been provided to date. I am not in a position to support the design effects unless the Applicant provides more information.

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 applicant has confirmed that vehicle tracking overlaps with kerb build-out and is assessed by the applicant as minor – 300mm only. However, as mentioned in #9, this gives rise to safety and maintenance issues, and I am not in a position to support the design effects unless the applicant provides more information.

12. Internal garage dimension

The applicant has confirmed (Commute response_ dated: 12-06-2025) that single garages will be a minimum of 3m x 5m clear, and double garages will be a minimum of 6m x 5m clear. With reference to Auckland Council Practice Note: RE100G- V 1- Garage width assessment - 15.06.2021 2, 3x5.4m² for single & 5.5x5.4m² for double garage to be maintained (AS/NSA2890). If the proposal provides less than the minimum requirement, it is considered non-compliant and creates significant efficiency and safety issues. As matters stand, I am not in a position to support the design effects unless the applicant provides more information.

13. Road 17 / Upper Orewa Road Sight Distance

The proposal initially included an intersection. Due to the low sight distance, this design was considered a safer option. However, the applicant has now proposed a roundabout with a 16.0m radius (32.0m dimension). This is considered a feasible solution. However, no vehicle tracking or visibility study has been provided. The draft design also shows a requirement for land acquisition from the neighbouring area. It is important that the updated design is fully workable. At this stage, I am not in a position to fully support the roundabout concept, unless the applicant provides more information.

14. PC79/ E27 infringements - accessible parking and loading bay

The applicant has indicated that a separate memo will be provided on PC79DV's accessible parking and loading bay requirements. However, no updated memo has been received as at the time of writing. I am accordingly not in a position to conclude that the PC79DV/ E27- accessible parking and loading bay requirements are satisfied.

Recommended Additional Conditions:

In reference to "Appendix 22 Delmore Fast-track - Proposed Consent Conditions" prepared by B&A:

- a. Item 11/14 - additional point to CTMP: Provide cleaning facilities within the site to thoroughly clean all vehicles prior to exit, to prevent mud or other excavated material from being dropped on the road. In the event that material is dropped on the road, resources should be on hand to clean up as soon as possible.
- b. Item 38 - edits to visibility splay: Prior to the occupation of residential units, the consent holder must establish and maintain 2.0m x 2.5m visibility splay on either side of all vehicle crossings (including JOAL crossings) in accordance with Figure 3.3 of Standard

ASNZS2890.1-2004, whereby any vegetation within the splay area should be limited to 0.6m in height and any fencing should be permeable and restricted to a maximum of 1m in height.

- c. Prior to the occupation of residential units, the consent holder must establish and maintain speed management measures as per PC79DV, being one within 10m of the road boundary and then one every 30m at JOALS.
- d. Prior to the occupation of residential units, the consent holder must provide a high-friction finish on concrete footpaths with gradients steeper than 8% (Refer to Figure 2 & 3_ “20250612 Commute All AC Responses” _ Commute Special Comment Response dated: 12.06.2025).
- e. Prior to the occupation of residential units, an active mode connection towards the town centre via path across SH1 to the existing paths to the east side must be in place.
- f. Prior to the occupation of residential units, the consent holder must provide traffic priority pavement markings and associated signage at JOAL 6 between lots 154 & 55 where the lane narrows to 3.5m for a 25.0m length.