

Sunfield Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure 8:

Transport (Auckland Council)

Kate Brill

4 August 2025

Transport Memo (Auckland Council)

Author: Kate Brill, Consultant Associate Transportation Planner, Auckland Council

Date: 4 August 2025

1. This memorandum addresses the transportation and traffic engineering aspects of the Sunfield proposal with regards to the relevant rules of the Auckland Unitary Plan.

Qualifications and Relevant Experience

2. I hold the qualification(s) of Bachelor of Science in Geography, and have 23 years of experience in transport planning, traffic engineering and land development. I have prepared expert evidence and technical assessments for resource consent applications and notices of requirement for designation applications and have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities on multiple occasions.

Code of Conduct

3. 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.

Specialist Assessment

4. I have reviewed the transport aspects of the application documents and Auckland Transport's (**AT**) memo dated 4 August 2025, and the accompanying reports from Beca (Craig Richards) and Progressive Transport Solutions (Martin Peake). My review focuses on the internal operation of the roading network and accessways, within the limits of the proposed Sunfield city.
5. In addition to an assessment of the internal transport network, I undertook a high-level assessment of transport matters external to the development, i.e. the wider road network; and the interface with the development and existing road network. This was a high-level assessment only as AT is providing an assessment on the wider road network and the linkages to Public Transport and Walking / Cycle facilities. Many of the gaps in information and concerns considered by Abley have been covered by AT. I have therefore not duplicated these areas of concern and I confirm that I am in agreement with the deficiencies covered by AT and Progressive Transport Solutions
6. In preparing this review, I have taken into consideration the following documents and correspondence:

- Sunfield Integrated Transportation Assessment, prepared by Commute, dated 10 February 2025 (ITA)
 - Planning Report prepared by Tattico, dated February 2025
 - Draft Conditions of Consent, dated 31 March 2025
 - Various Masterplan documents
 - Sunfield Scheme Plans, prepared by Maven Associates, dated February 2025
 - Commute's letter dated 17 July 2025 responding to the Council's comments dated 16 June 2025.
7. I had input into the Council's 16 June 2026 memorandum on s67 matters / information gaps. Key transport matters identified through my input into that memo are summarised below (excluding matters raised by AT):

Parking and Trip Generation

8. The development proposes that 1 in 10 dwellings will have a parking space, which is about 10% of the 'typical' parking rate of 1 parking space per dwelling – however I am concerned that the car ownership rate of future residents is likely to exceed 1 car per 10 dwellings. There is a high likelihood that residents will try to park on berms, within the 6m wide trafficable laneways, kerbside parking on internal roads and overflow parking into neighbouring suburbs.
9. The ITA recommends that physical obstructions are put in place to ensure parking is not possible in these areas, such as bollards, planting or fencing, however these measures are not shown on the plans, nor in the draft conditions. It is not considered sufficient to rely on continuous enforcement from AT as resourcing may not allow for the higher level of enforcement required for this type of development. I recommend the Architecture and / or Landscaping Plans demonstrate physical obstructions in all the areas where parking is not permitted such as berms, laneways and carriageways. This should occur throughout the development including the residential, industrial and employment areas. Alternatively, the applicant should demonstrate that parking management can be undertaken by alternative means via Resident / Incorporated Societies as described in Item 2.3.1 in Commute's letter dated 17 July 2025.
10. Transport modelling of key intersections has been undertaken assuming a significantly lower trip generation rate than the industry accepted rate, due to the lower parking rate of 1 car park per 10 dwellings. In the event that more than 10% of residents own cars and park in areas where it is not intended, the trip generation of the development will be higher than the transport modelling forecasts. The ITA states that movements at several intersections are expected to operate at a Level of Service (LOS) F, which is generally not considered acceptable when it impacts the through movement on busy arterial roads. In the event that more than

10% of residents own cars and park in areas where it is not intended, the trip generation will be higher, potentially resulting in key intersections being over capacity.

11. The draft conditions (Conditions 120 and 123) address when the intersections need to be upgraded. However, the modelling assessment in the ITA only demonstrates the operation of the intersection after the upgrade. There is no assessment determining when the current intersection would trigger an upgrade. It is recommended that a detailed modelling assessment is undertaken to demonstrate at which stage of development would trigger the need for an intersection upgrade before the application is approved. I have included this in the draft conditions in the event the modelling assessment is not undertaken prior to the application being approved.

Emergency Services and Other Service Vehicles

12. It is not clear from the proposal how emergency services, moving trucks and other service vehicles will access dwellings. The ITA states they will utilise service hubs which may be up to 75m distance from a dwelling. This could result in difficulties for moving furniture, repair work, and for emergency services access.
13. The low provision of car parking may result in illegal parking, which in turn can lead to problems accessing the site for emergency services. This issue has been encountered in the adjacent Addison subdivision and is discussed in Auckland Council's research report *"Living in Addison: An investigation into the lived experience of a master planned housing development in Auckland"*, November 2019¹. It is recommended that the applicant identify how the issues identified in Council's review of the Addison development will be avoided for the Sunfield development.

Internal laneways and service hubs

14. The application does not provide details of access, vehicle tracking or parking provision within the service hubs or laneways. More detailed information is required to understand if the operation of the laneways and service hubs are workable.

Monitoring Modal Share

15. Continuous monitoring is recommended, if the application is approved, to ensure the highly ambitious modal share is achieved for the development, including a robust set of monitoring conditions of consent to ensure that mitigation is provided if the number of trips exceed the trip generation anticipated in the ITA. This level of monitoring has been used in places such as Auckland's Wynyard Quarter or the Beachlands South Precinct Plan (Precinct I458 in the Auckland Unitary Plan). The draft conditions suggest that a Travel Plan should be in place for

¹ <https://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/publications/living-in-addison-an-investigation-into-the-lived-experience-of-a-master-planned-housing-development-in-auckland/>

the industrial workplaces. I consider monitoring / travel plans should apply to all activities within the development including residential and employment areas.

Transport effects covered by Auckland Transport

16. As discussed above, the effects on the external road network including proposed roading projects undertaken by others (e.g. Mill Road) and linkages to Public Transport and Walking / Cycling facilities have been covered by AT. I am in agreement with AT's reporting and conclusions on these matters.

Conclusion

17. As matters stand, I do not support the application in its current form, as it does not adequately address the transport effects identified during the Section 67 process. There remain a number of material information gaps, which need to be addressed to enable a proper assessment of the proposal (i.e. intersection modelling to determine when upgrades are required; measures such as physically restricting parking to ensure the assumed trip generation is adopted). There is a risk that adverse traffic effects will be significant in the event that the development does not achieve the ambitious trip generation assumed in the ITA.
18. As noted already, my review has been limited to the internal operation of the Sunfield development, and should be read alongside the broader assessment undertaken by AT.

Comment on Proposed Conditions

19. The draft transport conditions are not considered sufficient to mitigate the proposal's adverse transport effects or address the information gaps.
20. I offer some initial comments on conditions below. Revision of Conditions 123 and 125 are recommended as well as several additional conditions.

Condition 123

21. Condition 123 specifies the stage of development key intersections will require an upgrade. However, the modelling assessment undertaken in the ITA does not provide the basis for the staging i.e. the modelling does not demonstrate the stage when an intersection upgrade would be required. More detailed modelling is required to determine the triggers / stages for the intersection upgrades.

Recommendations

22. I recommend that the following information is demonstrated prior to the application being approved:

- (a) Produce a comprehensive monitoring schedule to ensure that the trips generated by the Sunfield development do not exceed the trip generation assumed by the modelling undertaken in the ITA. The Monitoring schedule should include mitigation measures in the event that trip generation exceeds the forecasted trips. This should be monitored throughout the stages of development, and continue after full development.
- (b) Produce a comprehensive monitoring schedule to ensure the number of vehicles parked within the development aligns with the intended provision of parking. This should be monitored throughout the stages of development, and continue after full development.
- (c) A modelling assessment is undertaken to determine the stage/s of development which trigger the intersection upgrades.
- (d) Demonstrate vehicle tracking of an appropriately sized vehicle for any road or accessway used by heavy vehicles including rubbish trucks, emergency vehicles and service vehicles.
- (e) Produce plans showing physical measures to prevent illegal parking on roads, berms, accessways, service hubs and laneways. Alternatively, provide more information on the validity of parking management methods described in Item 2.3.1 in Commute's letter dated 17 July 2025.
- (f) Provision of a compliance assessment of Chapter E27 - Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part).