



Memorandum

To	Calum McLean
Copy	Heather Perring
From	Justine Wilton
Office	Westlink
Date	29 August 2023
File/Ref	2-980WL.LR SR8822
Subject	RC13924 Tinex Industrial Ltd, 245 Te Puna Station Road, 2 year activity

1 Summary

As requested, I have reviewed the Section 92 responses in conjunction with the original material supplied and my earlier responses in relation to this application (RC13924).

Essentially, my advice to Council is the same as for the Abatement Notice hearing:

- o The proposed access provision is substandard.
- o The Te Puna Station Road/Te Puna Road intersection has not been upgraded in accordance with the Structure Plan requirements because there has not been any change in the way the right turn from Te Puna Road is managed.

In addition, I am concerned that there is no mention of the travel management plan as discussed in the expert caucusing (which recommended all inbound traffic associated with the business park to use SH 2/Te Puna Road rather than relying on the reserve road that goes underneath the Wairoa bridge and through the carpark.

The Clarke Road chicanes have not been effective in stopping through traffic but it may not be reasonable to expect the applicant to remedy this other than to require a Travel Management Plan that identifies the permitted heavy vehicle routes to and from the site.

The other concern I have is that once Tauranga Northern Link is open, the Business Park's traffic volume cap will be dissolved, and we do not know how much traffic each site will ultimately generate. Any compromise on best practice for the current consent could be exploited by the Business Park parties going forward, and this could leave Council exposed to costly retrofits once the Business Park traffic builds.

2 Detailed Discussion

2.1 Site Access

The TA says that no changes to the access are proposed but the additional information refers to a modified Code of Practice Diagram A with no widening opposite the vehicle crossing (on the erroneous basis that there is little to no right turning traffic generated by the development).

The absolute minimum standard for the access that Council should consider is a Development Code Diagram A with dimensions to suit the expected vehicles and for the existing 85th percentile speeds of through traffic and the vehicle crossing must be wide enough to carry the proposed two-way traffic. Ultimately, the applicant is required to construct what is currently known as NZTA's Diagram E full widening (Pre 2005, this layout was called Transit NZ Diagram D) to meet the Structure Plan condition. Note that there could be alternatives that would deliver the same or better safety performance which, if the applicant proposed, would be worthy of consideration but I think they are unlikely to want to do those (because they'll cost more) and past performance has shown an inclination to provide substantially less than best practise.

Accordingly, I recommend that the applicant either:

- 1a) provide an access that is fit for purpose for two-way traffic (both on Te Puna Station Road and within the vehicle crossing) in general accordance with Waka Kotahi's current Diagram E access layout in the Planning Policy Manual with a flare radius modified to suit the expected vehicles as required by the Structure Plan.

OR

- 1b) provide an access that is fit for purpose for two-way traffic (both on Te Puna Station Road and within the vehicle crossing) in general accordance with Council's Development Code's Diagram A access with a flare radius modified to suit the expected vehicle and with widening long enough for the proposed vehicles and for following traffic to pass a stationary truck waiting to turn right. This layout is only to be considered as an interim layout for the traffic volume as specified in this application. *(This is what I went with for the abatement notice hearing but I just think Council should make it clear that this doesn't satisfy meet the Structure Plan condition).*

AND

- 2) The vegetation along the site's frontage (including within the road reserve) must be cleared so that compliant sight distances are achieved (sight distance towards Clarke Road is currently not available until the vehicle has encroached the live lane).

Note that in either case, the vehicle crossing must be wide enough for two-way flow for the expected vehicles so that traffic on the road does not have to give way to people leaving the site and so that once a driver is committed to a turn, they can complete it without conflict and without having to stop whilst still partially in a traffic lane; and widening opposite the vehicle crossing must be provided because Te Puna Station Road carries two-way traffic and all of the site's heavy traffic comes in via a right turn from the west. I have explicitly stated these two requirements in the recommendation due to the applicant's previous history of not wanting to cater for two-way traffic at the vehicle crossing and not wanting provide the widening opposite the vehicle crossing.

2.2 Te Puna Road Right Turn Treatment

As previously discussed, including in the Joint Witness Statement and in the abatement notice hearing, there has been no change in the right turn provision for people turning right from Te Puna Road onto Te Puna Station Road. Either a right turn bay must be provided on Te Puna Road or another alternative treatment that delivers the same or better safety outcome could be considered (eg a roundabout, tunnel, etc). Realistically, a right turn bay is likely to be the lowest cost solution to satisfy the intent of the Structure Plan.

I recommend that:

3. A right turn bay (or similar right turn treatment) must be installed on Te Puna Road at Te Puna Station Road to safely provide stacking for right turning vehicles.
4. The intersection layout will need to be adjusted to cater for tracking of the expected vehicles so that other road users (eg those waiting to turn right out of Te Puna Station Road) aren't at risk of collision.

2.3 Wairoa Bridge underpass

The Wairoa Bridge underpass is not a secure route and only part of it is managed by Roothing and I understand that Calum has expressed reservations about relying on this as a route. In caucusing, we agreed that travel management plans would require right turns on SH 2 to be done via the Te Puna Road/SH 2 roundabout rather than under the bridge.

The safety concern I have with the Wairoa Bridge route is that it goes through a car park where people are moving around, and it does not look like a road so carpark users may not be expecting through traffic. The difficulty is that Waka Kotahi installed signs on SH 2 directing people to use this route (I'm not certain that Council was consulted about this) so Council may look a bit contradictory in telling people not to use it. Provided that Te Puna Station Road does not revert to a through route for people heading north from SH 2, then there won't be much of a demand for traffic under the bridge generated by the applicant.

I recommend that:

5. Roothing should confirm their position on the use of the route.
6. If there is any likelihood that Te Puna Station Road could be opened up to northbound traffic then the effects on pedestrian safety in the carpark portion of the under-bridge route should be addressed as it is not best practice to have a through road in a pedestrianised area without safety measures in place. These upgrades could be conditioned although if the Waka Kotahi signs that direct people to use the route through the carpark remain, it could be unreasonable to expect the applicant to fund improvements here and their staff vehicles are likely to be only a small portion of the traffic that use it.

Alternatively, the applicant could be conditioned to avoid use of the route but note that this is onerous on Council to monitor and, if staff ignore the condition, then the safety risks to the carpark users are still present.

2.4 Clarke Road

My understanding of the Structure Plan condition about traffic calming on Clarke Road is that there was a concern that the Business Park traffic might use Clarke Road and that there was a desire by the residents to deter that from happening. It is difficult to prevent the applicant's traffic from using Clarke Road since it is open to the public and the monitoring required to

enforce any route choice could be quite onerous (although it is worth including as a condition so that it can be enforced if necessary).

Ideally, Council should decide whether additional measures to prevent through traffic on Clarke Road are feasible. Measures could include:

- creation of a culdesac midblock
- creation of multiple one-way sections and speed tables to make the route slow to drive and uncomfortable for HCV drivers
- closing Clarke Road at the Te Puna Station Road end
- a Bylaw banning heavy vehicles (with an exemption permit for residents)

Alternatively, Clarke Road could be widened so that it can easily carry two-way traffic on the sealed carriageway and off-road footpaths/shared paths could be built but this might be contrary to the intent of the Structure Plan condition and would require consultation with the affected residents.

Assuming that Clarke Road is not going to be widened and welcoming to Business Park Traffic, I recommend:

- 7) The applicant should provide a Travel Management Plan that prescribes travel routes for the heavy vehicles and for the staff light vehicles. In particular, the plan shall exclude Clarke Road as a permitted route.