Jo Hart

From: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 19 December 2023 9:16 am
To: Jo Hart
Cc: Hannah Pettengell; Mike Nixon; Cameron Young; Leon Da-Silva
Subject: FW: PPC 13 Cresta Avenue and 96 Beach Haven Road - Auckland Council traffic specialist preliminary comments
Attachments: BH Cresta.pdf; BH Ranga.pdf

Good morning Jo

Thanks for sending these comments through. Please see mine and Mike's combined responses below and attached.

We trust this now closes out the matters. If you could please now give me an ETA for completing the reports that would be great. If you can send through the notification docs for checking we can do that before the break.

Please give me a call to discuss if you need.

Ngā mihi | Kind regards,

RACHEL MORGAN
Director
021 638 797
rachelm@barker.co.nz

barker.co.nz

From: Mike Nixon <Mike@commute.kiwi>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 8:57 AM
To: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>
Cc: Hannah Pettengell <HannahP@barker.co.nz>; Cameron Young <cameron@dsbuilders.co.nz>; Leon Da-Silva <leon@dsbuilders.co.nz>
Subject: Re: PPC 13 Cresta Avenue and 96 Beach Haven Road - Auckland Council traffic specialist preliminary comments

See comments below.

Mike Nixon
Principal Transport Consultant
Commute Transportation
P 09 869 2825 M 021 685 113
E mike@commute.kiwi W www.commute.kiwi
A 4 Leek Street, Newmarket 1023, Auckland
P PO Box 128259, Remuera 1541, Auckland

From: Jo Hart <Jo.Hart@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2023 4:52 PM
To: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>; Hannah Pettengell <HannahP@barker.co.nz>
Cc: Cameron Young <cameron@dsbuilders.co.nz>; Eryn Shields <Eryn.Shields@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: PPC 13 Cresta Avenue and 96 Beach Haven Road - Auckland Council traffic specialist preliminary comments

Hi Rachel

I've just received the comments from the traffic specialist – I haven't been able to discuss these with Eryn as he is unavailable for the rest of the afternoon. For the purpose of time constraints between now and the end of the working year, I have included the comments below and will provide any additional comments on Monday after I've had a chance to discuss the traffic specialist's comments with Eryn.

The traffic specialist's comments are as follows:

I note overall that transportation issues previously raised through review of the previous resource consent for the site (BUN60397498) have been considered in more detail through the current ITA, which includes more and updated commentary in relation to trip generation, parking and access for example. I would additionally note overall that I do not consider that adjoining area has any significant pre-existing issues with traffic congestion of safety.

However, I have identified the following recommendations below, which I would recommend as the basis for a Further Information Request from the applicant.

Gap: Insufficient Assessment around potential long-term transport outcomes resulting from proposed Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone

Gap in the information submitted
The ITA considers only a single trip generation scenario under the proposed Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone, comprising 80 apartments of one to two bedrooms. It is not clear as to whether this scenario represents the most intense use of the land which could be permitted under the new zone, and hence whether it represents the greatest traffic generation potential for the site.

I note that the architectural plans for the previous proposal for 81 dwellings under resource consent application BUN60397498 illustrate three storey apartment buildings on the site, to achieve this dwelling yield on the site. While the Unitary Plan policy for the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone refers to development being 'typically up to three storeys' and an objective to achieve 'character of predominantly three storeys', policy H5.6.4 refers to a height limit of 11 metres, which could potentially allow for residential buildings of up to four storeys in height.

Request for information
I would recommend requesting further assessment from the applicant, of a more intense land use scenario for the site which could be permitted, based on permitted activities and the maximum permitted building height under the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone, including assessment of the transport effects of such a scenario.

Why this is needed
To understand potential long-term transport effects which could result from permitted development activities within the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban zone.

80 units is in reality, the maximum that could be achieved on the site, when accounting for the other design standards that need to be complied with and what a realistic and viable development would be.

However, for expediency Mike has done a sensitivity test where he has increased all traffic volumes by 25% (this increases background traffic volumes as well as plan change traffic volumes). Both intersections still perform very well (see attached).

Gap: Lack of pedestrian crossing facility on Beach Haven Road to cater for new desire line from the subject site to Beach Haven local centre.

Gap in the information submitted
While Section 2.3.2 if the TA Report acknowledges that there is no pedestrian cut-through on the splitter island on the western approach of the Rangatira Road / Beach Haven Road roundabout, it does not propose the provision of a new pedestrian crossing facility across Beach Haven Road in this vicinity, to cater for the new pedestrian desire line between the subject site and Beach Haven Local Centre.

In addition, the TA Report does not consider the potential safety conflict between the new pedestrian desire line, neighbouring vehicle crossings emerging onto Beach Haven Road and the location of twin bus stops on Beach Haven Road adjacent to the southern access point. Pedestrian movements accessing the site could hence conflict with bus movements and local vehicle turning manoeuvres.

Request for information
I would recommend requesting further work from the applicant to consider options to provide formal pedestrian crossing facilities to cater for the new desire line between the subject site and Beach Haven Local Centre, whilst also allowing for safe access to the bus stops on both sides of Beach Haven Road. If appropriate, this should consider options for short-distance relocations of the two bus stops, to alleviate potential conflict between pedestrians and buses.

Why this is needed
This information is needed to ensure that the PPC proposal can be integrated safely into the existing urban environment and appropriately fulfil desired transport outcomes of the Unitary Plan policy for the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone, including promoting walkable neighbourhoods and achieving attractive and safe streets and public open spaces.

We agree that the pedestrian cut through is desirable and needed to support improved accessibility in the Beach Haven community. This was discussed at the resource consent hearing. In our view, this is an existing deficiency and would have a wider benefit and therefore the responsibility of Auckland Transport. While a cut-through is not provided, there is an existing island which does provide a 'refuge' facility for pedestrians.

Gap: Assessment of Vehicle / pedestrian visibility at exit onto Cresta Avenue
Gap in the information submitted
While the TA report assesses vehicle intervisibility at the site exit onto Cresta Avenue, it does not assess vehicle-pedestrian intervisibility at this location.

Request for information
I would recommend requesting assessment of vehicle /pedestrian intervisibility at the site exit onto Cresta Avenue, according to an appropriate standard such as 'Australia / New Zealand Standard for Parking facilities Part 1: Off-street car parking', to ensure that appropriate pedestrian visibility splays can be achieved. This assessment should include confirmation that that any new vegetation or boundary structures provided at the exit point to not adversely affect visual permeability.

Why this is needed
This information is needed to ensure that the site access arrangements will function safely and efficiently, integrating well with the surrounding environment, particularly as the proposed new vehicle accessway is bordered by the boundary fence to 15 Cresta Avenue immediately to the north and by vegetation immediately to the south.

This is a matter that can be addressed at resource consent stage and is already addressed by existing rules in E27. Given the location of the proposed vehicle access, pedestrian visibility splays can be achieved on both sides. Again, this was addressed at the resource consent hearing.

Additional Observation – Non-complying bicycle Parking

The TA report for the plan change contains conflicting information in relation to bicycle parking provisions, as follows:

- *The adopted 'likely development scenario' proposes 72 bicycle parking spaces to serve 80 dwellings.*
- *Section 6.3 of the TA report acknowledges that under Unitary Plan provision E27.6.2, 80 resident cycle spaces and 4 visitor bicycle parking spaces are required, with the intention that exact locations for cycle parking spaces would be confirmed in due course.*

The former reference is thus inconsistent with Unitary Plan requirements and a shortfall in bicycle parking provision would trigger engagement with Auckland Transport at resource consent phase. Notwithstanding this, the latter reference indicates that this issue could be appropriately addressed at the resource consent phase. I would recommend seeking confirmation from the applicant that the latter reference reflects the intention of the Plan Change proposal.

This is a plan change not a resource consent. Any future development will need to comply with the bike parking standards that apply at the time a resource consent application is made.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Jo

Noho ora mai | Stay well

Jo Hart | Senior Policy Planner
Regional, North, West and Islands Planning
Plans and Places
DDI 09 890 8291 | Mob 021 948783
Auckland Council, Level 16, 135 Albert Street, Auckland
Visit our website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

In the office = ✓ Work from home = WFH				
MON	**TUE**	**WED**	**THU**	**FRI**
WFH	**WFH**	**WFH**	✓	**WFH**

From: Rachel Morgan <RachelM@barker.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 15 December 2023 10:41 am
To: Hannah Pettengell <HannahP@barker.co.nz>
Cc: Jo Hart <Jo.Hart@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Cameron Young <cameron@dsbuilders.co.nz>
Subject: Beach Haven precinct plan

Hi Hannah

Would you please prepare a precinct plan map for the plan change for Jo?

Jo is finalising the reporting at the minute and trying to wrap everything up for Eryn/Warran to review next week/early Jan.

Transport report coming through today so if you could please line up Mike to review asap that would be good. We would need him to turn around next week.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [SENS Beach Haven Road/ Cresta Avenue PM Proposed (Site Folder: General)]

Output produced by SIDRA INTERSECTION Version: 9.1.5.224

PM Peak Hour
Proposed
Site Category: (None)
Give-Way (Two-Way)
Flow Scale Analysis: Constant Scale Factor = 125.0 %

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	Mov Class	Demand Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Arrival Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back Of Queue [Veh. veh	Dist] m	Prop. Que	Eff. Stop Rate	Aver. No. of Cycles	Aver. Speed km/h
East: Beach Haven Road															
5	T1	All MCs	195	2.7	195	2.7	0.161	0.2	LOS A	0.6	4.1	0.15	0.21	0.15	48.6
6	R2	All MCs	96	0.0	96	0.0	0.161	4.9	LOS A	0.6	4.1	0.15	0.21	0.15	47.3
Approach			291	1.8	291	1.8	0.161	1.7	NA	0.6	4.1	0.15	0.21	0.15	48.1
North: Cresta Avenue															
7	L2	All MCs	38	0.0	38	0.0	0.025	4.8	LOS A	0.1	0.7	0.17	0.50	0.17	45.6
9	R2	All MCs	7	0.0	7	0.0	0.008	6.6	LOS A	0.0	0.2	0.42	0.59	0.42	44.6
Approach			45	0.0	45	0.0	0.025	5.1	LOS A	0.1	0.7	0.21	0.51	0.21	45.4
West: Beach Haven Road															
10	L2	All MCs	14	0.0	14	0.0	0.052	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.08	0.00	48.3
11	T1	All MCs	83	4.8	83	4.8	0.052	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.08	0.00	49.5
Approach			97	4.1	97	4.1	0.052	0.7	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.08	0.00	49.3
All Vehicles			433	2.1	433	2.1	0.161	1.8	NA	0.6	4.1	0.12	0.21	0.12	48.1

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Options tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA (TWSC): Level of Service is not defined for major road approaches or the intersection as a whole for Two-Way Sign Control (HCM LOS rule).
Two-Way Sign Control Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Control Delay: Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA queue estimation methods are used for Back of Queue and Queue at Start of Gap.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity Formula: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Arrival Flows used in performance calculations are adjusted to include any Initial Queued Demand and Upstream Capacity Constraint effects.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [SENS Beach Haven Road/ Cresta Avenue AM Proposed (Site Folder: General)]

Output produced by SIDRA INTERSECTION Version: 9.1.5.224

AM Peak Hour
Proposed
Site Category: (None)
Give-Way (Two-Way)
Flow Scale Analysis: Constant Scale Factor = 125.0 %

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	Mov Class	Demand Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Arrival Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back Of Queue [Veh. veh	Dist] m	Prop. Que	Eff. Stop Rate	Aver. No. of Cycles	Aver. Speed km/h
East: Beach Haven Road															
5	T1	All MCs	78	10.2	78	10.2	0.066	0.2	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.17	0.22	0.17	48.5
6	R2	All MCs	38	0.0	38	0.0	0.066	5.0	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.17	0.22	0.17	47.2
Approach			116	6.8	116	6.8	0.066	1.8	NA	0.2	1.6	0.17	0.22	0.17	48.0
North: Cresta Avenue															
7	L2	All MCs	71	0.0	71	0.0	0.049	5.0	LOS A	0.2	1.4	0.24	0.51	0.24	45.4
9	R2	All MCs	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.001	5.8	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.34	0.53	0.34	45.1
Approach			72	0.0	72	0.0	0.049	5.0	LOS A	0.2	1.4	0.24	0.51	0.24	45.4
West: Beach Haven Road															
10	L2	All MCs	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.076	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	0.00	48.7
11	T1	All MCs	141	6.5	141	6.5	0.076	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	0.00	49.9
Approach			142	6.5	142	6.5	0.076	0.1	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	0.00	49.9
All Vehicles			330	5.2	330	5.2	0.076	1.8	NA	0.2	1.6	0.11	0.19	0.11	48.2

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Options tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA (TWSC): Level of Service is not defined for major road approaches or the intersection as a whole for Two-Way Sign Control (HCM LOS rule).
Two-Way Sign Control Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Control Delay: Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA queue estimation methods are used for Back of Queue and Queue at Start of Gap.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity Formula: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Arrival Flows used in performance calculations are adjusted to include any Initial Queued Demand and Upstream Capacity Constraint effects.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [SENS Beach Haven Road/ Rangatira Road PM Proposed (Site Folder: General)]

Output produced by SIDRA INTERSECTION Version: 9.1.5.224

PM Peak Hour
Proposed
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout
Flow Scale Analysis: Constant Scale Factor = 125.0 %

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	Mov Class	Demand Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Arrival Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back Of Queue [Veh. veh	Dist] m	Prop. Que	Eff. Stop Rate	Aver. No. of Cycles	Aver. Speed km/h
South: Rangatira Road															
1	L2	All MCs	141	0.0	141	0.0	0.404	5.2	LOS A	2.8	20.3	0.49	0.59	0.49	44.4
3	R2	All MCs	293	6.7	293	6.7	0.404	8.2	LOS A	2.8	20.3	0.49	0.59	0.49	44.1
3u	U	All MCs	12	0.0	12	0.0	0.404	9.5	LOS A	2.8	20.3	0.49	0.59	0.49	44.2
Approach			446	4.4	446	4.4	0.404	7.3	LOS A	2.8	20.3	0.49	0.59	0.49	44.2
East: Beach Haven Road															
4	L2	All MCs	497	5.3	497	5.3	0.512	4.6	LOS A	4.5	32.6	0.37	0.47	0.37	45.4
5	T1	All MCs	167	3.9	167	3.9	0.512	4.4	LOS A	4.5	32.6	0.37	0.47	0.37	45.8
6u	U	All MCs	13	0.0	13	0.0	0.512	8.8	LOS A	4.5	32.6	0.37	0.47	0.37	45.3
Approach			678	4.9	678	4.9	0.512	4.6	LOS A	4.5	32.6	0.37	0.47	0.37	45.5
West: Beach Haven Road															
11	T1	All MCs	71	3.7	71	3.7	0.147	5.7	LOS A	0.8	5.9	0.52	0.61	0.52	44.7
12	R2	All MCs	63	4.2	63	4.2	0.147	8.7	LOS A	0.8	5.9	0.52	0.61	0.52	44.2
12u	U	All MCs	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.147	10.0	LOS B	0.8	5.9	0.52	0.61	0.52	44.2
Approach			136	3.9	136	3.9	0.147	7.2	LOS A	0.8	5.9	0.52	0.61	0.52	44.4
All Vehicles			1259	4.6	1259	4.6	0.512	5.8	LOS A	4.5	32.6	0.43	0.53	0.43	44.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Options tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: SIDRA Roundabout LOS.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Control Delay: Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA queue estimation methods are used for Back of Queue and Queue at Start of Gap.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity Formula: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Arrival Flows used in performance calculations are adjusted to include any Initial Queued Demand and Upstream Capacity Constraint effects.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [SENS Beach Haven Road/ Rangatira Road AM Proposed (Site Folder: General)]

Output produced by SIDRA INTERSECTION Version: 9.1.5.224

AM Peak Hour
Proposed
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout
Flow Scale Analysis: Constant Scale Factor = 125.0 %

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	Mov Class	Demand Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Arrival Flows [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% Back Of Queue [Veh. veh	Dist] m	Prop. Que	Eff. Stop Rate	Aver. No. of Cycles	Aver. Speed km/h
South: Rangatira Road															
1	L2	All MCs	47	5.6	47	5.6	0.361	4.6	LOS A	2.5	18.5	0.35	0.57	0.35	44.2
3	R2	All MCs	374	8.5	374	8.5	0.361	7.5	LOS A	2.5	18.5	0.35	0.57	0.35	44.0
3u	U	All MCs	21	0.0	21	0.0	0.361	8.8	LOS A	2.5	18.5	0.35	0.57	0.35	44.1
Approach			442	7.7	442	7.7	0.361	7.3	LOS A	2.5	18.5	0.35	0.57	0.35	44.0
East: Beach Haven Road															
4	L2	All MCs	299	5.7	299	5.7	0.328	4.7	LOS A	2.2	16.3	0.37	0.49	0.37	45.4
5	T1	All MCs	86	6.2	86	6.2	0.328	4.5	LOS A	2.2	16.3	0.37	0.49	0.37	45.7
6u	U	All MCs	9	0.0	9	0.0	0.328	8.9	LOS A	2.2	16.3	0.37	0.49	0.37	45.3
Approach			393	5.7	393	5.7	0.328	4.8	LOS A	2.2	16.3	0.37	0.49	0.37	45.5
West: Beach Haven Road															
11	T1	All MCs	149	5.3	149	5.3	0.276	6.7	LOS A	1.6	11.9	0.61	0.65	0.61	44.4
12	R2	All MCs	87	3.0	87	3.0	0.276	9.6	LOS A	1.6	11.9	0.61	0.65	0.61	44.0
12u	U	All MCs	3	0.0	3	0.0	0.276	10.9	LOS B	1.6	11.9	0.61	0.65	0.61	44.0
Approach			238	4.4	238	4.4	0.276	7.8	LOS A	1.6	11.9	0.61	0.65	0.61	44.2
All Vehicles			1074	6.3	1074	6.3	0.361	6.5	LOS A	2.5	18.5	0.41	0.56	0.41	44.6

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Options tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: SIDRA Roundabout LOS.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Control Delay: Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA queue estimation methods are used for Back of Queue and Queue at Start of Gap.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity Formula: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Arrival Flows used in performance calculations are adjusted to include any Initial Queued Demand and Upstream Capacity Constraint effects.