

21 June 2022

16-485

Mr Gerard Thompson
Barker & Associates Ltd
Auckland

Dear Mr Thompson

Mission Bay Apartments Traffic Assessment

1. As discussed with Mr Allan at Ellis Gould I am pleased to set out my traffic and transportation assessment of the proposed fast track application for up to 170 residential apartments on the Drive Holdings Limited site at Mission Bay.
2. My full name is John Douglas Parlane. I am a Traffic Engineer. I am a Director of Parlane and Associates Limited. I have a Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering and Certificates of Proficiency (Masters Level) in Traffic Engineering, Transportation Planning, and Environmental Law from the University of Auckland. I hold a Bachelor of Applied Economics from Massey University. I am a Chartered Member of the Engineering New Zealand (CENgNZ) and for the last thirty-four years have worked as a specialist Traffic Engineer and Transportation Planner.
3. I have been asked to summarise the traffic and transportation issues relating to the application by Drive Holdings Limited for resource consents relating to the construction of seven new multilevel buildings on 75-79, 81-87 & 89-97 Tamaki Drive, 6, 8-10, 12 and 14 Patteson Avenue, 26, 28, and 30 Marau Crescent, Mission Bay ("**the Site**") providing for retail, food and beverage, and residential activities and supporting car parking, loading bays, vehicle manoeuvring areas, landscaping and plant ("**the Project**"). The Project will incorporate approximately 240 carparks (located on the ground and two basement levels), storage for bikes in accordance with the Auckland Unitary Plan ("**AUP**") provisions, and loading areas within the body of the building on the ground level. Vehicle access will be provided at Patteson Avenue (re: the ground floor and basements) and at Marau Crescent (re: the basement only).
4. The following comments are informed by the extensive work that I undertook from 2018 to 2022 in relation to a previous development proposed for the Site of generally similar overall scale to the Project ("**Previous Proposal**"). The Previous Proposal was declined consent in the Environment Court for reasons relating to its bulk and height but not its traffic and transportation effects. The Project


adopts the same car parking, loading bays, vehicle access and vehicle manoeuvring arrangements as were proposed in the Previous Proposal and that were acceptable to Auckland Council in that context.

5. The Project has been designed to integrate land use activities with the transport network. The Project includes up to 170 residential apartments and approximately 2421 m² of commercial/retail space which is most likely to be used for food and beverage sales. The application will involve demolishing the existing buildings on the Site which include the Berkeley Cinema, shops, restaurants and some residential units.
6. Relevant to my expertise, the Project requires assessment in terms of the AUP under the Business Local Centre zone (Chapter H11) and Transport (Chapter E27) rules. A resource consent is required under the AUP trip generation rule as: the proposed retail activities exceed the commercial activity threshold of 1667 m²; and the proposed residential activities exceed the threshold of 100 apartments. The Project will comply with the other parking, access and loading rules in the Unitary Plan subject to minor variance on a ramp that complies with the Australian and New Zealand parking standard.
7. I carried out extensive modelling of the traffic effects that might be generated by the Previous Proposal and am confident that the level of traffic that will be generated by the Project will be accommodated within the existing road network without creating adverse traffic congestion or safety effects. I consider that the Project will not generate any noticeable adverse traffic or pedestrian effects. I reached this conclusion because the Project will generate 58 fewer vehicle movements in the critical evening peak hour and 92 fewer vehicle movements in the critical Saturday peak hour than would have been generated by the Previous Proposal (assuming the Project includes 170 units).
8. Those conclusions are made in the context of the existing traffic conditions in Mission Bay. There are currently days in Mission Bay when the beach generates very high levels of people visiting and when Tamaki Drive is used by very high levels of vehicles to get to and from Mission Bay and as part of a recreational drive along the waterfront. At these times there can be significant queues of cars along Tamaki Drive in particular and on Patteson Avenue to a lesser extent, as well as large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists. The existing road network has not been designed to accommodate all of that activity and still provide for free-flowing traffic. Queues and delays are simply an expected occurrence of those very busy sunny days. The Project will provide additional reasons for people to

visit Mission Bay on those days, but it is unreasonable in my view to try and provide road capacity at those times to meet such peak demands.

9. The main potential for the Project to create adverse traffic effects is during the construction period including the excavation of the basements. During this period a significant number of trucks will visit the Site to load excavated material or to offload building supplies and structural components. A Construction Traffic Management Plan is required to manage the potential effects of these activities.
10. The Site and Project are exceptionally well placed to promote transport efficiency, given the Site's location on a major arterial route, Tamaki Drive, which accommodates public transport (bus) and active modes (walking and cycling) and its proximity to the City Centre.
11. My support for the Project assumes the imposition of appropriate conditions to ensure potential adverse effects are mitigated. Conditions regarding traffic and transportation matters were agreed with Auckland Council through the application process relating to the Previous Proposal. I consider that those conditions will form an appropriate basis for a refined set of conditions for the Project.
12. From a traffic engineering and transportation efficiency perspective there are no reasons that would preclude redevelopment of the Site in accordance with the Project.

Yours faithfully



John Parlane BE(Civil), BAppEcon, CM Eng. NZ

Consulting Traffic Engineer

Parlane & Associates Ltd