

Transport Assessment on Resource Consent Application

September 2020

Service Request No: SR471670
File Reference:

Site Address: 26 Donald Street, Karori

1. Introduction:

1.1. The proposal is for a comprehensive care retirement village at 26 Donald Street and 37 Campbell Street, Karori.

1.2. The applicant for the proposal is Ryman Healthcare Ltd.

1.3. The development comprises:

- 60 care beds
- 68 living suites
- 180 independent apartments

1.4. The site is zoned outer residential in the WCC District Plan

1.5. The site of the proposed retirement village was formerly the Victoria University of Wellington (VUW) Teachers College and covers a site area of 3.06 hectares. It is sited in close proximity to schools and recreational facilities and within convenient walking distance of the Karori town centre and a wide range of local facilities. Marsden Village shopping centre is also within convenient walking distance.

1.6. The site is located conveniently for bus routes serving the City Centre, Universities and Wellington Regional Hospital.

2. Further Information Required:

2.1. I am satisfied that the information provided to support the application is adequate.

3. Legislative Requirements (i.e. District Plan / Standards / Design Guides)

3.1. Wellington City Council District Plan

4. Assessment:

4.1. My primary reference is the Transportation Assessment Report prepared for the applicant by Commute Transportation Consultants (CTC). This is included as Appendix E in the resource consent application and is dated 20 July 2020.

4.2. There are a number of transport matters relating to the proposed development which are covered in the applicant's assessment on which I provide comment below. These use the headings included in the Commute assessment as follows:

- Existing Environment
- Proposed Village
- Access
- Traffic Effects
- Parking
- Travel Plan
- Loading and Servicing
- Construction Traffic

5. Existing Environment:

5.1. CTC provides a detailed description of the existing environment. This is briefly as follows and covers the key aspects of the external environment:

- Transport Environment – the location within the local street network; Karori Road, Donald Street and Campbell Street.
- District Plan – The zoning is Outer Residential Area with the site subject to an Education Precinct overlay. The proposal is a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion including traffic effects and parking and site access
- Public Transport – There are five bus services proximate to the site with bus stops within 300m on the main Karori Road.
- Existing Traffic Volumes – These show moderate daily flows on the two streets providing direct access to the site, namely Donald Street and Campbell Street. Flows on Karori Road as the major principal road connecting through to the city centre, are high and access is appropriately provided by the traffic signal-controlled intersection at Donald Street and Karori Road.
- Road Safety – The NZTA- Crash Analysis System (CAS) data for the 5year period 2015 to 2019 indicates a relatively low incidence of crashes in the local area with no crashes at the existing site access points.

6. Proposed Village:

6.1. The proposal is for the construction and operation of a comprehensive care retirement village at 26 Donald Street and 37 Campbell Street, Karori, consisting of:

- 60 care beds
- 68 assisted living suites
- 180 independent apartments
- 190 covered parking spaces
- 40 parking spaces on grade

6.2. One vehicle access point is proposed on Donald Street with another vehicle access on Campbell Street. Both access points are located towards the eastern end of the site.

7. Access:

7.1. The main site access is located on Donald Street and uses an existing entrance which previously served the former Victoria University complex. A proposed new access is located on Campbell Street at the southern end of the site frontage and an existing access at the northern end is proposed to be disestablished.

Number of Access Points:

7.2. The District Plan (Section 5.6.1.4) allows for only one access to a site where access is available from both a collector road (in this case Campbell Street) and a local road (Donald Street). However the site currently has three access points and CTC suggests that the proposal for a total of two access points would be appropriate for this site which has long road frontages on both Campbell and Donald Streets.

7.3. I agree with CTC and consider that this very large site should have an access option available on both frontages, so as to provide a degree of choice of route for drivers and also to reduce the concentration of vehicle movements at any one access point. I consider that the proposed access points are well located being the furthest distance from the main Karori Road where traffic volumes past the access points will be typically lower.

Width of Access:

7.4. The District Plan (Section 5.6.1.4) specifies a maximum 6m crossing width for an outer residential zoning. As proposed, the Campbell Street access would be complying but the Donald Street access at 9m width would require consent.

7.5. In the case of the Donald Street access, there is an existing vehicle crossing at this location which served as a main driveway into the former Victoria University campus and measures around 6m on the Council's local map. CTC has given no explanation for the 9m crossing requirement although looking at the plans provided in the CTC assessment, it appears that the design includes a central traffic island incorporating a street lighting pole which will require a widened crossing. I consider this to be acceptable subject to the detail design being approved by council's transport team. I note that the vehicle tracking diagrams included with the CTC report show that the entry layout will be able to accommodate service vehicles entering or leaving the development site via the Donald Street vehicle access.

Sight Distance:

7.6. CTC has assessed the available visibility at the two proposed accesses and shown that they comply with the LTSA Guide RTS-6. *Guidelines for Visibility at Driveways*. This is satisfactory although I note that the District Plan requires a vehicle access assessment against AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 rather than the older RTS-6 guideline. However the proposal would comply with the District Plan in terms of sight distances, on the basis of the information provided by CTC.

7.7. I would also note that CTC refers to a secondary access on Donald Street and I assume this is an error as there is only a single vehicle access shown.

Internal Road Layout:

7.8. A central roading link is proposed with access to parking areas and key buildings within the site. The main access road width is proposed as 5.5m which is an appropriate width for

low volume 2-way access. CTC has provided additional information showing that vehicle tracking through the site will satisfy AS/NZS 2890 as required by Council.

Pedestrian Provision:

7.9. Pedestrian footpaths are proposed throughout the development with marked pedestrian crossings at regular intervals. Pedestrian access routes appear to comprehensively service the residential parts of the complex.

7.10. I note from the diagrams provided that it is intended to have a 10km/h speed limit within the site, and this will add a very useful additional layer of safety for pedestrians in particular and is a suitable speed limit for shared pedestrian and vehicle spaces where there is the prospect of pedestrians using the roadway on occasions.

7.11. External to the site, pedestrian footpaths and crossings are in place which will allow safe and convenient pedestrian access to and from the site via both Campbell and Donald Streets both of which provide access to Karori Shopping Centre or alternatively Marsden Village for shopping together with access to bus stops and other local amenities.

7.12. From the information presented, I consider the proposed internal roading layout is appropriate for this development as is the external transport infrastructure.

8. Traffic Effects:

District Plan:

8.1. CTC note that the Proposed Village is a discretionary restricted activity under the District Plan. They have assessed the local traffic effects at the two vehicle access points and the two key intersections at Karori Road/Campbell Street and Karori Road/Donald Street. I consider that this approach is logical.

Trip Generation:

8.2. CTC have presented a detailed assessment of expected vehicle trip generation for the proposed Village. They have referenced both the widely used New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (RTA Guide) and the New Zealand equivalent; NZTA Research Report TR 453: Trips and Parking related to Land Use (NZTA Report 453) methodology for comparison purposes and importantly provided survey data from two existing Ryman villages at Howick and Remuera which is more targeted than the other two data sources.

8.3. CTC have modelled the expected trip generation at Karori and this shows good correlation for daily trips against NZTA Report 453 and lower peak trips using the more targeted Ryman data. I consider the trip generation figures presented are a good representation of the likely outcome at the proposed Karori site.

Alternative Development Options:

8.4. CTC present some useful comparisons for trip generation for both educational use (which was the previous use of the site) and a typical outer residential use as per the current District Plan zoning. These comparisons show that the Proposed Village is expected to generate less peak hour trips than either of the other two options presented for comparison.

8.5. With regard to total daily trips, the proposal would generate less than an education option but more than a residential option, with the variations being relatively minor taken over a full day. The proposal would therefore be expected to have a lesser traffic impact at the more critical peak traffic times, than either of the other two options.

Traffic distribution:

8.6. CTC have provided estimated traffic distribution figures relating to the proposed two access points which will service the site. They suggest the 85% of traffic will access the site via Donald Street and 15% via Campbell Street. Also that 90% of trips will approach and leave via the east (city). I consider these assumptions to be reasonable and overall estimated trip numbers are quite low

Intersection modelling:

8.7. CTC has modelled the effect of the Proposed Village at the two local intersections at Campbell Street/Karori Road and Donald Street/Karori Road using recent traffic data. In the case of both intersections, the additional traffic generated by the development is demonstrated through the use of the industry standard SIDRA model, to have little effect on the performance of both intersections with no change to the current levels of service.

8.8. I consider these effects to be acceptable and have been shown by CTC to be less than those generated by either the former use of the site for education purposes or the potential permitted use for outer residential development.

9. Parking:

District Plan parking requirement:

9.1. The District plan Standard 5.6.1.3 requires a minimum of 1 space per household unit plus 1 visitor space per 4 households where there are 7 or more units for outer residential zones. It does not however have a separate standard applying to a retirement village which would be expected to have a different parking demand profile

RTA parking demand:

9.2. CTC has presented an assessment of demand using the RTA Guide and this provides a figure of 194 spaces in total for the residents, visitors and staff combined. This total is less than the proposed 230 spaces included in the application.

9.3. I note that CTC has not assessed the parking demand against TR 453 for some reason which is unclear. I have therefore checked the proposal against TR 453 and this produces a total parking demand at the 85% level of 232 spaces which I have assumed includes both visitors and staff. This figure is higher than that assessed using the RTA Guide and is very similar to the actual number of spaces proposed by Ryman.

9.4. I have also referenced advice on parking demands published by the NZ Trips and Parking Database Bureau (NZTPDB) which is a specialist organisation researching and collating trips and parking information for use in assessing demand in New Zealand, and NZTPDB suggests adopting the RTA Guide for elderly persons housing projects.

Parking provision:

9.5. CTC provides information on the parking provision at 5 recently approved Ryman villages. This consists of:

1 space per apartment
1 space per 5 assisted living suites/care beds
1 space per 2 staff members.
Total 230 spaces

9.6. I am therefore satisfied that the total parking provision for residential, visitor and staff parking proposed for the Karori Site is acceptable and can be expected to satisfy the expected demand without encroachment onto either Donald or Campbell Streets.

Parking dimensions:

9.7. CTC has provided confirmation that the parking space dimensions proposed within the development will comply with District Plan standards.

Ramps:

9.8. CTC has similarly provided confirmation that all vehicle ramps within the development will comply with District Plan standards and will satisfy maximum gradient and transition requirements.

Mobility/accessibility standards:

9.9. CTC refers to NZS 4121 as requiring a minimum of 7 mobility parking spaces, whereas they propose to provide a greater total of 11 spaces. They confirm the spaces will be designed to NZS 4121.

10. Travel Plan:

10.1. In Council's S.92 request dated 12 May 2020 the applicant was asked to provide information on and confirm whether they have put in place a staff travel plan at any other Ryman villages and whether they are considering a plan for the Karori site, with such a plan being in line with the Council's sustainable transport policies and be potentially applicable to a large site such as this, with substantial number of staff employed and routinely travelling to and from the site.

10.2. The response to this request is provided in page 25 of the CTC report and is that Ryman do not prepare a formal travel plan and do not consider one is necessary for the Karori development. They state that staff shifts are arranged to avoid commuter peaks and note that the site is well positioned for public transport and also walking and cycling. They note also that staff parking is provided at a rate of 1 space per 2 staff.

10.3. I am of the view that the site will have sufficient parking on site to accommodate both staff and residents parking requirements and not create parking pressure on adjacent streets. Also that the site is well located to provide travel options for those staff who either do not have access to a car or car share or choose to use public transport or walk or cycle.

10.4. However I suggest that none the less there is still merit in asking Ryman to develop a staff travel plan to promote/encourage car sharing or alternative work travel modes as a contribution to reducing emissions and link to Council's climate change policies. The net result is likely to be relatively modest but it is appropriate that such a major development participates in supporting the Council's wider environmental policies.

11. Loading and servicing

11.1. The Proposed Village will have one main loading bay within the site designed to accommodate a 9.2m rigid truck as specified by the waste management contractor. The CTC report provides plans showing manoeuvring envelopes for a truck to negotiate the internal roadways and access all the proposed service areas.

11.2. I have requested further information on vehicle clearances for parking and servicing areas which are covered and I am not at this point able to assess whether these comply with the District Plan.

11.3. Otherwise, based on the plans and information provided I consider that the proposed loading and servicing arrangements are appropriate to service the needs of the development. This includes access for emergency service vehicles.

12. Construction traffic:

12.1. The CTC report notes that the construction methodology has not been finalised and will depend on a range of factors including any resource consent requirements. They propose that a Construction Traffic Management plan is developed for the works and suggest a number of draft conditions.

12.2. I agree with this proposal which will be included in my recommended conditions.

12.3. In this regard the proposed CTMP should assume that as far as possible all construction activity will take place within the site with minimal if any use of adjacent road land for construction related purposes.

13. Conclusion:

13.1. Subject to my above assessment and proposed consent conditions, I am able to support the proposal in terms of its transport related effects.

14. Suggested Conditions

14.1. As referred to in Section 12 above, a Construction Traffic Plan (CTP) will be required to ensure the major development can proceed while ensuring the necessary safeguards are in place to protect the public from any adverse construction effects. The CTP will need to be prepared and submitted to the Council for approval, prior to any work starting on the site. The plan must include methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate, adverse construction traffic effects during the development of the site.

14.2. The CTP must include but not be limited to the following matters:

- Construction dates and hours of operation including any specific non-working hours for traffic congestion/noise etc. In this location, construction traffic movements must look to avoid school pick up and drop off times during school terms
- Truck route diagrams both internal to the Site and external to the local road network;

- Temporary traffic management signage/details for both pedestrians and vehicles to appropriately manage the interaction of these road users with heavy construction traffic
- Details of Site access/egress over the entire construction period. Noting that all egress points are to be positioned so that they achieve appropriate sight distance as per the Land Transport Safety Authority “Guidelines for visibility at driveways” RTS6 document
- An emergency (24/7) contact phone number
- A public complaints register
- Measures to deal with any collateral damage to vehicles and property
- Any related occupation of the public footpath or carriageway for construction related purposes

14.3. The applicant/consent holder should be required to develop a staff travel plan to promote/encourage car sharing or alternative work travel modes as a contribution to reducing emissions and link to Council’s climate change policies. The net result is likely to be relatively modest but it is appropriate that such a major development participates in supporting the Council’s wider environmental policies. This should be submitted to the Council for approval prior to the Proposed Village commencing operation.

14.4. All covered parking/loading areas will need to comply with the District Plan/AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 in regard to vehicle clearances. (see my comments under section 11.2.)

14.4. All related off-site works associated with the development must be completed prior to the Proposed Village commencing operation.

14.5. All redundant vehicle crossings must be reinstated by the applicant with new footpath and kerb and channel, prior to the Proposed Village commencing operation.

14.6. A vehicle access approval will be required for the construction of the new kerb crossings under Part 5. Section 18 of the WCC Consolidated Bylaw 2008.

15 . Suggested Advice Note:

15.1. A corridor access approval from the Council will be required before trucks and other heavy vehicles will be permitted on site.

Steve Spence
 Chief Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure, Wellington City Council
 P 64 4 803 8099 I M 64 21 227 8099
 E steve.spence@wcc.govt.nz