

## Comment on the Dominion Road Mixed-use Development Application

### 1. Contact Details

Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.

<b>Organisation name (if relevant)</b>			
<b>*First name</b>	Ian		
<b>*Last name</b>	Buckland		
<b>Postal address</b>	[REDACTED]		
<b>*Home phone / Mobile phone</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>*Work phone</b>	
<b>*Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)</b>	[REDACTED]		

All sections of this form with an asterisk (\*) are mandatory.

### 2. \*We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct
-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

### 3. Please provide your comments on this Application

If you need more space, please attach additional pages. Please include your name, page numbers and the project name on the additional pages

## 1. TRAFFIC AND PARKING

### 1.1. Increased Traffic Volume

Traffic on local road network, including my road (Prospect Terrace) will be increased due to additional cars (residences as well as customers and staff to commercial operations) and medium to heavy vehicles servicing the supermarket and other commercial operations. This will impact the quiet neighbourhood streets with excessive noise, traffic hazard, and excessive queues at intersections and development driveways, blocking the side roads and driveways of residences.

An Integrated Transport Assessment ITA has been prepared that essentially says everything will be alright... there will be additional traffic, but that is what you would expect. The ITA says that the extra traffic is good because it will push people to use other modes of transport. As residents we are looking to the ITA for concrete solutions to the additional traffic and the ITA really misses the mark in achieving this. In fact the report, in my opinion, seems quite biased toward the development in its conclusions.

#### Comments and Suggestions:

- a) Chicanes (similar to those used on Ranfurly Rd, Epsom) should be installed to restrict traffic size on side streets including Prospect Terrace. These could replace existing table top speed humps where appropriate.
- b) Where practicable (for example in commercial leases) commercial traffic should be restricted from turning left from Prospect Terrace into the development, right from the development onto Prospect Terrace, left from the development onto Grange Road and right from Grange Road into the development. Commercial deliveries should be restricted to off peak times.

### 1.2. Intersection Safety

Currently, turning right into from Prospect Terrace onto Dominion Road is risky as it is often difficult to find a suitable gap in the traffic. The pedestrian lights in front of the development help, on occasion, by blocking traffic coming from the south. However, often drivers turning right into from Prospect Terrace onto Dominion Road wait until there is no traffic from the south turning right into Prospect Terrace and then wait for a gap in traffic from the north before pulling into the centre strip. This manoeuvre often occurs in front of a vehicle travelling from the south or Burnley Terrace travelling north. All the while, these drivers must be conscious of frequent motorbikes, bikes and scooters that use the bus lane on both sides of the road, and pedestrians who might walk in front of your vehicle (or, as frequently happens, be standing on the cross hatched area between Prospect Road and Burnley Terrace) while you are focusing on traffic movements. It is a high risk area and it is surprising that people do not get injured on this intersection more often.

The development is going to increase traffic, especially traffic on Prospect Terrace and Grange Road. Notably, it will increase traffic turning right on to Dominion Road from these side roads and traffic from the south (including large supply vehicles for the supermarket) turning across the southbound traffic on Dominion Road into these side roads. The latter effectively blocking right turning traffic causing further driver frustration. The ITA concludes from modelling that there will be no additional queues at these intersections. Further the ITA says that, because there will be no increases in queues and delays (based on its modelling exercise), that the safety profile of the intersection will remain unchanged and so drivers will not take additional risks.

I myself (and others who regularly use this intersection) do not believe the modelling predictions. We envisage significant slow moving queues leading to driver frustration and resulting risk taking. The ITA recommends some improvement measures, involving removal of diagonal parking and double lanes at intersections. This will make a significant efficiency improvement but I do not believe that what has been proposed is enough to mitigate the worst effects.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) The existing pedestrian traffic lights across Dominion Road in front of the development should be moved south and used to control the Grange Road intersection (possibly extending to King Edward Street). This would be an efficient way of enabling the following:
  - o Traffic turning right from Grange Road facilitated to turn into Dominion Road
  - o Traffic turning right from King Edward Street travelling south on Dominion Road facilitated to turn into Dominion Road
  - o Pedestrian movements across Dominion Road, Grange Road and King Edward Street would be facilitated
  - o Vehicles turning right from Prospect Terrace would be able to turn during pedestrian phases where traffic on Dominion Road was temporarily halted
- b) The crosshatched median currently supporting traffic from Prospect Terrace turning northbound onto Dominion Road is very narrow. This could be made safer by making it wider and encouraging its use by removing the crosshatches for 20m or so, perhaps adding some left arrows so that traffic filters into the live lane. I appreciate there is not much space but I think this measure would significantly enhance the safety of this intersection.
- c) Introducing chicanes as previously discussed will push larger vehicles that currently use Prospect Terrace and Grange Road onto other side roads (including Valley Road, which is more able to absorb this larger traffic), helping to reduce the traffic on these residential side roads.

### **1.3. Street Parking**

New residences and commercial operations will compete with local people for street parking where parking is already currently difficult. Although the practice of minimising parking spaces in Auckland central area is supported by Auckland Council, it is naïve to think that development residences that do not have allocated parking will only be purchased by people without cars. According to the ITA page 25, there will be 89 spaces for the residential units (including provision for residential parking, 128 bicycle spaces and a residential loading bay), servicing 122 apartments. I am unsure of how many parks would be available to residents but assuming 14 bikes per parking space, this amounts to say 9 parking spaces. That leaves 80 spaces less the loading zone – 79 spaces for 122 apartments. Accounting for those who have no car, those who have 1 or more cars, those temporarily away and those with additional visitors it might be reasonable to assume that, on average, each apartment will have one car. Assuming all parks in the residential parking area are used, this would result in an overflow of 43 cars looking to park within local street parking at any given time. Assuming an average of 5 meters street frontage used by a parked car this would occupy 215 meters of the currently squeezed parking availability on the neighbouring side streets

Additionally, according to the ITA, diagonal parking on local roads will be reduced, pushing customers for the Dominion Road shops onto side streets, further competing for limited parking.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) Residents should have priority through residents only parking. I note that residents recently rejected a proposal for the Mount Eden South Residential Parking Zone which included Prospect Terrace. I believe this is because such a zone would remove parking rights that residents already have and charge residents for reinstatement of these rights. Also notably, local residents were surveyed prior to the announcement of the development and full understanding of the parking implications of the development. I believe that each property in the residents only parking area should be allotted one free street carpark. Residents should be able to purchase another if necessary. I
- b) The development should be required to provide more parking and temporary visitor parking for the new residences.
- c) My feeling is that, despite the rhetoric, the developers are counting on residents being able to use street parking. If the true intention is that apartment purchasers do not have vehicles, this can be facilitated through residents only parking that specifically excludes the apartments. This would need to be communicated as part of the marketing to ensure these purchasers are informed that street parking will not be available.

### **1.4. Pedestrian Safety**

Pedestrians crossing high trafficked areas on Prospect Terrace and Grange Road adjacent the development will be exposed to significant risks due to multiple lanes and high traffic flow. This will be exacerbated by commercial traffic turning right from Dominion Road onto Prospect Terrace

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) The current pedestrian refuge at Dominion Rd end of Prospect should be moved 50m up Prospect Terrace and a proper pedestrian crossing installed.
- b) Moving the pedestrian lights as previously stated would support pedestrians crossing Grange Road.
- c) If (b) is not progressed then I suggest mitigation (a) should be applied to Grange Road as well

## **2. OPERATIONAL NOISE AND VIBRATION**

### **2.1. Operational Vibration**

The development's eastern boundary, including the access tunnel to the loading bay, is founded on hard volcanic rock. This material will effectively transfer vibration caused by heavy traffic, and will likely shake and damage adjacent houses.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) Heavy traffic to be restricted daytime off peak hours
- b) Vibration to be independently monitored
- c) Properties along eastern boundary to be initially independently assessed for damage as a baseline and reassessed independently annually for damage

## **2.2. Operational Noise**

I imagine that the carpark area and supermarket will have air-conditioning and or ventilation fans. It is not clear where these will be placed, what the hours of operation will be, how loud they will be and what steps are in place to mitigate the noise.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

Since I am unaware of the details I cannot review the proposed mitigations.

## **3. OVERLAND FLOW STRIP**

### **3.1. Strip Maintenance**

The eastern boundary of the proposed development comprises a planted strip and overland flow storage area. It is likely that rubbish will accumulate along the eastern boundary of the development, both from off site (for example, material accumulated by the overland flow path, and on site, for example wind-blown rubbish from development residences). Unmanaged vegetation along the development eastern boundary will encourage, rats and other pests.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) The strip along the eastern boundary to be regularly maintained with rubbish being removed and vegetation managed

### **3.2. Walkway Proposal**

The houses adjacent this boundary are quiet residences with private backyards. The development might lead to an increase in people accessing the western boundaries of the properties to the east of the development. One of the questions in Appendix 23, p147 suggests that a walkway and other facilities be installed in this corridor.

My feeling is that such an area would not be used much for leisure by the general public, but rather would provide a focus for undesirable activity including alcohol consumption, vagrancy and crime that would affect the residents along this boundary. It is likely that the wall would become a target for taggers and this would be an eye-sore and lead to ongoing maintenance.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) Access to this area should be limited. Gardening and maintenance personnel would need access but general public should be kept out
- b) Walls should be installed to the north and south sides of the strip to prevent public access.
- c) Providing residents on this boundary with a right of access may be a way of ensuring this area is mowed regularly, and provide a security layer along this boundary.

## **4. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

The demolition and construction phases of the development will be noisy, dusty and cause significant vibration affecting adjacent neighbours. Appendix 14 section 3.3 outlines the need to remove 1.2m of basalt from the eastern boundary using rock breakers and large 20 tonne

excavators. The material excavated will need to be removed by a fleet of large trucks and possible trailers.

#### **4.1. Dust, and Windborne Health Hazards**

Windblown dust from excavations, concrete cutting activities, demolition and other deconstruction and construction activities is likely to be a nuisance for immediate neighbours and beyond. The Infrastructure report provides mitigating controls for erosion but largely avoids commenting on dust nuisance. Appendix 18 discusses contamination including the likelihood of asbestos and lead in the existing building. Some basic controls are discussed but the detail seems to be deferred to impending Site Management Plans. I look forward to reviewing these documents.

#### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) Wetting and covering exposed surfaces, especially during activities that generate dust.

Construction planning to help manage dust nuisance

- b) Site Management Plans to be independently reviewed especially with respect to controls for asbestos (and other contaminants), dust, and vibration.

#### **4.2. Noise and Vibration**

Noisy activities include; demolition, rock breaking, pile drilling, earthworks, Appendix 14 discusses the noise and vibrations that will emanate from the construction area. The report notes that due to the *competent massive* basalt, the use of a hydraulic breaker and pick will be required, and that it is likely that excavation would be significantly slower than the fractured basalt (and presumably requiring significantly more energy). The excavation of the eastern side of the site adjacent the residences adjoining this boundary is estimated will require removal of approximately 2,000 m<sup>3</sup> of massive basalt.

It is concerning that in Appendix 14 Table 3.3 under Geotechnical Risks, the risk identified as 'Vibrations and noise greater than anticipated' with consequence 'rated with a probability of 'medium' (which seems quite likely) and has a consequence 'Potential to damage adjacent structures' the first mitigation is "Reasonable noise and vibration limits set within the Resource Consent'. Unravelling this in plain English, it is moderately likely that adjacent buildings will be damaged and the first proposed mitigation is to seek lower compliance thresholds. A second mitigation of "smaller construction plant required to be used" is not likely to be a desirable solution for the developer if the basalt is massive (Appendix 14 section 3.3), unweathered and strong as table 2.2 indicates. Other mitigations include vibration monitoring and raising hoardings, and these are affirmed by the Acoustic Report (Appendix 20)

Appendix 20 page 13 states an assumption that residential homes will be empty during business hours (implying that noise will not disturb us). This is not the case at my house and others that I am aware of. I myself work from home most of the time. My eldest boy is studying and works at home much of the time. My partner visits every second week and works from home. I have people who do shift work at my property and sleep during the day. Also I am planning to move my mother who is suffering from memory loss, into my house. She gets confused by loud noises so will be significantly impacted by ongoing excessive noise.

Appendix 20 (section 3.3.3) states that a piling rig is expected to be the noisiest plant item and so the noise prediction analysis is based on a single piling rig. My feeling is that the noise levels from

the construction area will be caused by a combination of plant items used at the same time including piling rigs, rock breakers, trucks, excavators and concrete saws. I have not seen any analysis of likely plant combinations.

Although I am happy that hoarding are being proposed, I feel that it is unlikely that this mitigation will significantly diminish the noise which will be ongoing and unrelenting for periods of the construction. Without proper mitigation, complaints from neighbours on this boundary are likely to consume compliance resources and disrupt the construction activities.

### **Comments and Suggestions:**

- a) I consider that the nuisance and disruption caused by noise and vibration has not been properly addressed by the acoustic report Appendix 20. It seems from page 18 that the AUP rules allow for 76-80 dB  $L_{Aeq}$  for durations of up to 15 days, even though the description makes it clear that the noise level would be excessive and uncomfortable. Personally this is not acceptable. People living on my property should be able to remain on the property without undue discomfort.
- b) Appendix 20 page 19, Table 2 shows duration in days where noise levels are expected to break AUP rules. There is no mention on how the construction will mitigate the noise and vibration that does not quite break the rules but will persist for months severely disrupting the wellbeing of the affected residents.
- c) I would like to see independent (perhaps council led) noise level monitoring using properly calibrated and certified noise level loggers with access to data by residents.

## **1. COMPLIANCE AND COMPLAINTS**

It would be useful to have a document outlining clearly the compliance requirements of the development construction and operation, including noise and vibration levels, along with a test plan for ensuring compliance and a process for raising non-conformances.

Thank you for your comments