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## 1 Project Description

### 1.1 Introduction and Background

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) and its investment partner the Provincial Development Unit (PDU) are seeking to investigate a range of options to confirm preferred design features as part of a wider programme of work that will achieve key investment objectives along State Highway 11 (SH11). This work will form part of the wider Twin Coast Discovery Route (TCDR) Programme, which aims to upgrade sections of the 800 km TCDR to support local communities, to accommodate the increasing number of people visiting the area, and to encourage others to do the same.

The TCDR Programme Business Case (PBC) identified a programme of investment in the area that included improvements to SH11. This Single-stage Business Case (SSBC) identifies the recommended improvements on sections of SH 11 required to deliver the outcomes identified in the PBC, as well as outcomes tailored specifically to the study area.

### 1.2 Project Scope

A Shared Use Path (SUP) is proposed from Paihia Town Centre to Waitangi along the coastal edge. The installation of a SUP between Paihia and Waitangi will create a direct link between the two towns for active transport modes and provide an attractive cycle route and pedestrian walkway along the coast. Currently, the existing Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail (TCCT) links Kawakawa to Opua. This is proposed, under the Cycleways SSBC, to be extended from Opua to Paihia. Once this connection is completed, the SUP will form part of the TCCT and will support local trips and cycle journeys in the region.

Refer to the extent of work shown in Figure 1, along SH11 Marsden Road, connecting from the north of Nihonui Point to south of the roundabout with Te Karuwha Parade.


Figure 1: Project Extent of Paihia to Waitangi SUP

### 1.3 Purpose of Report

The purpose of the Preliminary Design Report is to provide the outline the proposed works to accommodate a SUP along SH11 within the project extents which have been developed based on the adopted design standards and principles in line with Waka Kotahi and other key stakeholders consultation. The design standards, parameters and assumptions that have been used to develop the preliminary design are contained in the technical note - 511738-0000-TEQ-CC-0001 Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement Design Criteria attached in Appendix A.

### 1.4 Existing Site Description

### 1.4.1 Existing Site Description

SH11 (Marsden Road) is a key route for the Tai Tokerau's tourist economy. It provides access to Bay of Islands and acts as a gateway to Waitangi.

The existing cross section within the project extents consists of:

- A $1.5-2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ footpath on the northern side along the waterfront. There is an existing $3.0-3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ wide footpath / SUP along the park, guarded by safety fence which narrows down to a 1.5 m footpath on either side.
- Combination of angle and parallel parking exists on along the northern footpath.
- A 1.2 - 1.5 m wide footpath exists along the properties on the southern side of SH 11 .
- There is an existing zebra crossing outside the Waitomo Petrol Station.
- Existing traffic lanes ranging between $3.2-4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ wide


### 1.4.2 Topography and Survey

A topographic survey was undertaken in June 2021 by WSP. The general layout of the site slopes in the westbound direction towards the roundabout.

## 2 Road Layout and Geometry

### 2.1 Design Philosophy

Refer to the technical note, 511738-0000-TEQ-00-0001 Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement - Design Criteria attached in Appendix A for the design philosophy adopted to provide a solution described in the sections below.

The proposed works are intended to create a safe, compliant and efficient environment to improve the overall function of project extents. The design will not exacerbate any existing design deficiencies and will attempt to improve or remove existing deficiencies, where practicable. It is noted that due to the existing geometry and physical constraints, improvements to meet current standards or desirable level of service will not always be possible and any increases in traffic volumes can exacerbate existing issues

As far as practicable, the geometry of existing roads and services has been retained, and it is noted that it is not the intention of this project to change the risk profile of associated infrastructure.

### 2.2 Design Standards

Refer to Section 4 of the technical note, 511738-0000-TEQ-00-0001 Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement - Design Criteria attached in Appendix A for the design criteria used to develop the proposed solution.

### 2.3 Design Criteria

Refer to Section 6 of the technical note, 511738-0000-TEQ-00-0001 Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement - Design Criteria attached in Appendix A for the design criteria used to develop the proposed solution.

### 2.4 Design Development

### 2.4.1 Existing SUP Geometry

The general design philosophy for the proposed SUP is that the desirable width will be achieved by removal of angled parking where possible. Where there are Pohutukawa Trees, the existing footpath edge will be retained dependent on arboriculture assessment. Where there is no parking available to utilise for SUP width, existing footpath will be widened towards the coastal edge. Due to the change in grade between the existing footpath and the beach, a balance of achievable SUP width without significant earthworks will be required to achieve the agreed programme and project costs. The northern footpath along Marsden Road ranges from $1.5-2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ wide. A section of the footpath is 3.0 m wide outside the Rotary Playground.
The existing cross fall of the footpath ranges from $0.5-2 \%$ either draining towards the carriageway or the beach. The intention of the proposed SUP is to follow the existing footpath grades as far as practicable unless General Cross Section

As per the design criteria in Section 6.3.2 of the technical note in Appendix A; following cross section and grades of the SUP is proposed:

Table 1 General Proposed Cross Section

| Element | Value | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SUP width | 3.0 m |  |
| General Traffic Lane | 3.5 m minimum | Provision of parallel parking results in a lane width of 4.5 m <br> from existing width of 5.2 m between CH530 - CH600 |
| General traffic lane <br> crossfall | No changes required |  |
| Separated Path | 2.5 (minimum) - 3.0 m | One-way separated path is proposed around the zebra <br> crossing due to the existing Pohutukawa trees. Westbound <br> path entering the zebra crossing is 3.0 m whereas the exit path <br> is 2.5 m. This was the achievable width due to the placement <br> of existing tree. No change to the existing footpath behind the <br> trees is proposed. Refer to Section 2.4 .11 for departure on <br> existing footpath. |
| SUP buffer (for parallel <br> parking) | 0.8 m | Buffer zone between parallel parking and SUP <br> SUP crossfall |
| $2-4 \%$ | Existing crossfall has been followed. Some sections of footpath <br> such as between CH $220-C H 280$ is relatively flat where <br> there is no kerb. The footpath and parking space drains to a V- <br> dish channel. existing crossfall has been followed resulting in <br> $1.5-2.0 \%$ crossfall in some sections. Refer to Section 2.4 .11 <br> for departure. |  |
| SUP longitudinal <br> gradient | Existing longitudinal <br> grades maintained | Existing grades have been followed as much as possible to <br> minimise earthworks and effect drainage |

### 2.4.2 Sight Distance

Based on the equation from Section 5.7.1 from the Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, the required Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) (based on a design speed of $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for the flat sections) on the path is 25 m . For the worst-case scenario ( $3 \%$ downhill gradient), the required SSD is 27 m . The design complies with these requirements.

### 2.4.3 Kerbing

Existing kerb and channel where the SUP is widened towards the beach is retained. Where widening into the carriageway to achieve the proposed SUP width is required, new kerb and channel is proposed is in accordance with Far North District Council Engineering Standards DNDC/S/3 Standard Kerb and Channel. Refer to drawings DRG-RR-0101 - 0104 for extents of new kerb and channel.

### 2.4.4 Trees

There are 21 Pohutukawa Trees within the project extents. To minimise consenting risks, protecting the trees has been adopted as the design philosophy of the proposed SUP. Minimum of 0.5 m from the tree diameter is maintained for any proposed SUP works. Where the trees are already at the boundary of the existing footpath (CH $560-600$ ), SUP widening is achieved through widening into the carriageway. The proposed SUP pavement near the tree is shown in the typical cross section D in drawing DRG-RR-0302 and will follow the general construction methodology in consultation with the Arborist assessment:

- The existing concrete is to be removed and a permeable geotextile sheet is placed on existing basecourse.
- New basecourse is then placed on top of the sheet with the concrete footpath. Cutting into the existing roots is avoided.

To maintain minimum vertical clearance of 2.5 m and sight distance, regular maintenance of tree branches is proposed.

Refer to the arborist assessment report in Appendix G.

### 2.4.5 Parking

There are 89 number of angle parking spaces within the project extents. Provision of SUP required existing angled parking to be converted to parallel parking as shown in drawings DRG-RR-0101-0104 resulting in 31 number of parallel parking spaces. Due to the constrained width available between the existing Pohutukawa Trees and traffic lane, a 2.1 m wide parking space has been adopted with 0.8 m buffer between the SUP and general traffic lane for door opening zone. This is in accordance with MOTSAM Section 2.11 Parking, Figure 2.13. There is adequate parking space on side streets which has been identified for alternative parking to mitigate for the loss of parking. Refer to the Parking impacts assessment and capacity of surrounding carparks attached in Appendix C.

Conversion of angled parking to parallel parking results in removal of the existing wooden vehicle stoppers between CH 230 - 290. For safety reasons, Amardillo cycle lane separators (or similar) are proposed along the flushed buffer zone as shown in drawing DRG-RR-0102. This creates a physical separation between the SUP and parking and prevents vehicles from riding over the proposed SUP that is at the same level as the carriageway as existing.

### 2.4.6 Zebra Crossing

The existing zebra crossing has been upgraded with kerb buildout on either side creating a shared space for pedestrian and cyclists. Path users are allowed to use either direction; however, a separated path environment has been proposed due the location of Pohutukawa Trees where the existing path diverts behind the trees. To avoid removal of trees, one-way separated path has been proposed where the westbound SUP users are encouraged to use the proposed 3.0 m wide SUP in front of the tree and the eastbound SUP users are encouraged to use existing footpath behind the tree through line markings.

Due to constrained width, a separated path environment is proposed through line markings, however; it is expected path users will use the shortest route on desire line. It is the intention to discuss the arrangement during client review and road safety audit for an optimal solution in this situation.

### 2.4.7 Safety Fence

As per Austroads, Part 6A - Paths for Walking and Cycling Figure 5.10, a partial fence is required if the batter slope is $1 / 3$ or steeper and the vertical drop is 0.25 to 2.0 m for a path less than 5.0 m wide. Hence, due to the existing embankment at the footpath approaching towards Nihonui Point, widening to achieve the minimum agreed SUP width results in a drop and a fill embankment of $1 \mathrm{~V}: 2 \mathrm{~V}$ to tie into the existing embankment without significant earthworks. This requires provision of a safety fence with handrail for pedestrians and cyclists on the SUP. Refer to drawing DRG-RR_0301 for fence type.

### 2.4.8 Signage

Any new proposed signage for the SUP has been designed in accordance with standards outlined in Section 4 of the technical note attached in Appendix A.

SUP signage has been proposed at the start and end of the SUP.

### 2.4.9 Pavement Marking

Pavement markings have been designed in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 4 of the technical note attached in Appendix A.

The design of the road markings has been developed in accordance with applicable standards to ensure a safe and intuitive layout consistent with the surrounding road network.

Removal of redundant road marking shall be done to standard with hydro blasting, so no evidence of old marking exists.

Refer to the general arrangement plans DRG-RR-0101-0104 for further details on proposed pavement marking in Appendix B.

### 2.4.10 Roadside Furniture

Any roadside furniture affected by the proposed SUP will be relocated:

- Existing bollards between $\mathrm{CH} 340-\mathrm{CH} 400$
- Existing footpath amenity lights owned by FNDC are removed and replaced with proposed SUP lighting.
- Any affected existing signage is relocated outside SUP in accordance with design standard referred in Section 6 of the technical note, 511738-0000-TEQ-00-0001 in Appendix A.
Refer to drawings DRG-RR-0101-0104 in Appendix B for affected roadside furniture.


### 2.4.11 Design Departures

Following design departures have been identified at the current stage of design. These departures may not be required post progression of design in the subsequent design stages and client comments:

- Following the existing footpath grades results in crossfall lower than $2 \%$ at some locations as per existing. Further geometric design development is required in subsequent design stage to assess improving the grades to fall between $2-4 \%$ as per standard.
- The existing footpath behind the zebra crossing is 1.5 m wide which is encouraged to use as a separated path for eastbound users. This width is less than the total width of 3.0 m required for one-way separated path (pedestrians and cyclists). Widening of this path has been avoided as it will require embankment regrading and fencing due to the existing slope towards the beach. However, the proposed improvements at the zebra crossing improves the current safety and facilities. In consultation with the client, no widening is required to the existing footpath. The proposed SUP buildout is to be used as a shared space rather than a separated path which is 2.5 m wide at it's pinch point. This is the minimum required width for a SUP without departure. Hence, no departure is required for the SUP width criteria and existing footpath width.

No other design departures have been identified at the current stage of design.

### 2.4.12 Safety in Design

A Safety in Design workshop was conducted on $1^{\text {st }}$ November 2021 in order to identify and assess the potential risks throughout the design, construction and operation of the project and to identify major hazards early for effective control.

This was achieved by including all disciplines within the workshop who informed the process when given design and operational considerations. A copy of the Safety in Design register and agreed outcomes is attached in Appendix H .

Key outcomes of the SiD workshop are summarised below:

- To minimise risk of effecting existing Pohutukawa trees through design as per arborist assessment and presence of an arborist on site during construction
- Review outcome of Road Safety Audit (when completed) and consider widening of pinch point through removal of car parking either side of the zebra crossing if deemed necessary by the safety audit team.
- Consider urban landscape design at the proposed kerb buildouts at the zebra crossing to encourage slow speed environment.


## 3 Street Lighting

### 3.1 Overview

This section identifies the key design criteria that has been adopted in the development of the Preliminary Design for the shared use path lighting. This includes the following items

1. Key Decisions that have been made or are pending
2. Design standards and criteria that have been used in the design
3. Existing lighting within the area
4. Proposed design solution

### 3.2 Key Decisions

The following table outlines decisions required to complete the lighting design for the shared use path.
Table 2 Key decisions for the lighting design of the SUP

| Item | Description | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subcategory of Lighting | Determination of the subcategory of lighting as defined in AS/NZS 1158. | Aurecon's proposed subcategory of PP2 was submitted to Waka Kotahi with no exceptions taken. |
| Light pole type and colour | Confirmation of light pole to be used for dedicated shared use path lighting. | Pending input from Far North District Council (FNDC). Waka Kotahi recommends using local suppliers for ease of maintenance / replacement. |
| Consideration of existing lighting | Unknown details about the existing light fittings that serve the adjacent State Highway 11 and current footpath. Aurecon proposed to ignore any contribution from these to the Shared Use Path (SUP) lighting | Aurecon's proposed subcategory of PP2 was submitted to Waka Kotahi with no exceptions taken. |


| Existing light pole clashes with SUP | Existing light poles that serve both SH 11 and the current footpath clash with the new SUP route. <br> Aurecon's proposal was to relocate the lighting serving SH11 to behind the SUP and provided a longer outreach arm so that the light fitting is in the same position as currently. Lighting serving the footpath and clashing with the SUP will be removed. | Aurecon's proposed subcategory of PP2 was submitted to Waka Kotahi with no exceptions taken. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maintenance of light fittings | The depreciation of light output from the new fittings is based on a five-year light fitting cleaning interval. | Pending, to be confirmed by FNDC. |
| Control of light fittings | The fittings are proposed to be controlled with a photocell on the electrical supply pillar. | IPending, to be confirmed by FNDC. |

### 3.3 Design Criteria

The installation will be designed to comply with the requirements of:
Table 3 Compliance requirements for lighting design

| Standard/ Guidelines | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| AS/NZS 1158 | Lighting for roads and public spaces |
| Part 3 Section 16 of FNDC Operative <br> Plan | District-wide provisions for Signs and Lighting |
| AS 4282 | Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting |

Where there are differences in the standards the design will comply with the more prescriptive/stringent requirements.

The road lighting subcategory as defined by the AS/NZS 1158 series of standards is PP2. This is based on a "High" level of pedestrian/cyclist traffic and a "Medium" fear of crime. The subcategory was proposed by Aurecon to NZTA with no exceptions reported back. The road lighting calculations have been carried out using AGI32. Road lighting calculations have been carried out using AGI32.

### 3.3.1 Maintenance Factor Criteria

The maintenance factor was worked out based on a 5 -year cleaning period which is the longest period available under the AS/NZS 1158 standard. The expected life of the fittings will be between 10-15 years, therefore interim cleaning will be required.

Light Source Lumen Depreciation (LLD): 0.95 based on 25 degrees ambient temperature and 50,000 hours until the lumen output drops below the proposed derating (0.95) and the luminaire requires replacement.

Luminaire Dirt Depreciation Factor (LDD): 0.86 based on Urban environment, 5-year cleaning interval.

### 3.4 Existing Lighting

Existing lighting around the proposed SUP area consists of road lighting serving State Highway 11's carriageway and amenity lighting for the waterfront footpath.


The existing light fittings appear to be a Sylvania Roadster, however the wattage was not ascertainable from site visits, nor was the information available in FNDC or Waka Kotahi records. As a result, the lighting design for the SUP will exclude any contribution from these fittings as they cannot be verified through calculations without further information. By not taking the existing lighting into account, it doesn't limit future options for upgrading the roadway lighting.

A number of the amenity lights along the footpath clash with the new route of the SUP. These will need to be removed with cabling pulled back to the nearest fitting to make way for the SUP.

One of the light poles serving SH11 also clashes with the SUP. This fitting will be relocated to behind the SUP and installed with a longer outreach arm so that the light fitting maintains the same location and orientation as currently.

### 3.5 Proposed Design

### 3.5.1 Shared Use Path (SUP)

Shared Use Path lighting design along Marsden Road will be designed to comply with the illuminance based LTP's for lighting Sub-Category PP2 of AS/NZS 1158.3.1:2020. These parameters are shown below for reference.

|  | Average horizontal <br> illuminance <br> (En) <br> Lx | Point Horizontal illuminance <br> Lighting <br> Subsategory | llluminance (horizontal) <br> uniformity Cat P <br> (UE2) | Point Vertical <br> illuminance <br> (EPv) <br> Lx |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PP2 | 7 | 1 | 5 | .3 |

Extracted from AS/NZS 1158.3.1:2020

### 3.5.2 Spill Lighting and glare control

Potential glare and spill light from the lighting design has been assessed and mitigated in accordance to AS 4282 and Part 3 Section 16 of FNDC Operative Plan.

### 3.5.3 Road Lighting Controls

All new luminaires located on the road shall be equipped with an integral TMS compatible dimmable DALI Driver and a pre-wired 7 pin NEMA socket and Shorting Cap. FNDC to confirm luminaire control type.

### 3.5.4 Maintenance access to poles

The access for the maintenance of the poles for the installation can be done via Marsden road or the SUP.

### 3.5.5 New luminaries

New luminaires proposed to light the SUP are from ADLT's XSP range of light fittings.
Type L1 - ADLT XSP High Output Series

- Optic Type II Long (2LG)
- 29W; 3770 lumens
- 4000K
- NEMA 7 pin + DALI
- Black Finish


The type L1 light poles are proposed to be mounted on ADLT's proprietary PS Pole with a black finish as their design is more visually compatible with the light fitting. The black finish will also minimise the visual impact at night.

### 3.5.6 Electrical Supply and Control to Road Lighting

The utility supply in Paihia is operated and maintained by Top Energy. Any new electrical installations or alterations to existing will be coordinated with Top Energy and FNDC in the next design phase. All installations will be as per AS/NZS 3000 and Top Energy requirements.

The light fittings proposed will come with DALI control with a NEMA socket on the top of the fitting. The fittings are proposed to be controlled with a photocell on the electrical supply pillar. however final controls will be determined in conjunction with FNDC.

### 3.5.7 Safety in Design considerations

New light poles are mounted behind safety fences to eliminate risk of bikes clashing with poles.

## 4 Stormwater

### 4.1 Purpose of the Report

This stormwater assessment reviews the stormwater network requirements for the runoff from the proposed shared user path (SUP) and adjacent existing SH11 Marsden Road, which connects the Paihia waterfront development from the north of Nihonui point to the roundabout with Te Karuwha parade.

This preliminary assessment checks the existing stormwater network adequacy and capacity on Marsden Road following introduction of the proposed SUP on northern side, without consideration of stormwater treatment, flood pathways or volume attenuation requirements. Upstream and downstream runoff from outside of the project boundaries has also been excluded from this assessment.

This report identifies the existing stormwater network and hydrological environment within the project boundaries, provides recommendation for the stormwater reticulation layout to address any potential flooding and assess the effects of operation of the project's proposed stormwater network. It does not discuss the stormwater treatment requirements.

### 4.2 Existing Environment

### 4.2.1 Catchment Description

The SH11 Marsden Road project is situated 70km north of Whangarei and within the River Catchments: Bay of Islands Coast catchment area. Figure 2 below shows the Northland Regional Council sub-catchments map for this area.


Figure 2: Sub catchment areas (Source: Northland Councils Water Resources Map)

### 4.2.2 Existing Stormwater Management

The existing primary stormwater network along SH11 Marsden Road typically consists of a pit and pipe network as shown in the FNDC GIS database. Pipeline sizes vary from $300 \mathrm{~mm} \varnothing$ to $900 \mathrm{~mm} \varnothing$ concrete pipes (source: council GIS). The existing network also includes catchpits, manholes and wingwalls. These pipes appear to collect stormwater runoff from the road and ultimately discharge stormwater into sea on the northern side of project

Figure 3 below provides an example of the existing pit and pipe network along Marsden Road. There is currently no known stormwater treatment devices for stormwater flows captured along Marsden Road.


Figure 3: Existing Pit and Pipe network in green (Source: FNDC SW GIS Map)

Existing flooding has been assessed by GHD (source: FIDC (Flood modelling_GHD 2007)). It shows no flooding on the project site during a $1 \%$ AEP storm event. In Figure 2-3, there is some flooding away from Marsden Road and in the private properties adjacent to the project.


Figure 4: 1\% AEP Flood plain (Source: FNDC (Flood modelling_GHD, 2007))

### 4.3 Design Requirements

### 4.3.1 Relevant Standards and Documents

The stormwater assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the following design standards and guidance documents:

- Far North District Council Engineering Standards and Guidelines (2009) - section 4
- NZTA, P46 State Highway Stormwater Specification (2016)
- Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision: Chapter 4 - Stormwater
- New Zealand Standard 4404 (2010), Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure
- New Zealand Building Code (January 2017), Verification Method for Clause E1 Surface Water


### 4.3.2 Assessment Philosophy

The assessment for the stormwater reticulation system has been in accordance with the Far North District Council Engineering Standards and Guidelines (section 4). The stormwater assessment has focused on providing a low impact design solution where practicable throughout the project.

### 4.3.3 Design Parameters

| Hydrology (Rational) | 10-year Storm |
| :--- | :---: |
| Rainfall Depth* $(\mathrm{mm})$ | 22 |
| Rainfall Intensity* $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{h})$ | 132 |
| Rainfall Intensity* $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{h})$ <br> climate change factor | 149.4 |

*Taken from 10min duration depth (FNDC Engineering Standards and Guidelines p76) given below


| Runoff Properties | Coefficient |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rational 'C' - Impervious | $0.95^{\star *}$ |
| Rational 'C' - Pervious | $0.35^{* *}$ |

[^0]Runoff flow rates have been determined using the Rational Method with a time of concentration of 10mins.

### 4.4 Proposed Stormwater Design

This section provides an overview of the sub-catchments and the proposed stormwater network design for the project.

### 4.4.1 Proposed SUP and Road Layouts

There are two typical road corridor layouts in the project:

1. SUP and Road Carriageway
2. SUP with Parking and Road Carriageway


Figure 5: Proposed Road Layout (SUP, PARKING AND ROAD CARRIAGEWAY)
The road has a crown in the middle so it has been assumed that half of the road flows towards the SUP side. Similarly the SUP also has two different crossfall - in some locations the SUP falls away from road carriageway and in a few locations the SUP flows toward the road carriageway (See Catchment area map below).

### 4.4.2 Stormwater Catchments and Flow Calculations

A preliminary assessment has been carried out to identify and demarcate the catchment areas. This was undertaken using survey, and interpretating existing contours existing stormwater networks and overland flow paths from the FNDC SW GIS Map.

The project has been divided into two contributing stormwater catchments along Marsden Road:
a) West Catchment Area ( $C A=0.272$ ha)
b) East Catchment Area ( $C A=0.112$ ha)


Figure 6: Catchment Area Map
The total area of the proposed stormwater catchments is 0.384 ha (including the portion of the SUP that flows towards the road in a few locations). The SUP is assumed to consist of impervious area only i.e. road and SUP with no grass.

The rational method was used to calculate the indicative network drainage flows for the 10 yr ARI event. Refer table below for summary of flows:

| Catchment area - East | 1121.749 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.1121749 | ha | CA length | 195 | m |  |
| Rational flows @ (2.781 CIA) | 44.283 | 1/s | Flows $\qquad$ (East CA) |  |  |  |
|  | 0.044 | m3/s |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers of CP Required | 3.0 no's |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing CP's in CA | 1.0 no's |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations: | Need to provide Min. (2) CP in this CA |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catchment area - West | 2725.163 | m2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.2725163 | ha | CA length | 296 | m |  |
| Rational flows @ (2.781 CIA) | 107.543 | 1/s | Flows @ P2W Project (West CA) |  |  |  |
|  | 0.108 | m3/s |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers of CP Required | 6.0 | no's |  |  |  |  |
| Existing CP's in CA |  | no's |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations: | Need to provide Min. (6) CP's in this CA |  |  |  |  |  |

Road and side parking zones will act as secondary flow paths for stormwater which ultimately discharge runoff into sea by going over the SUP.

### 4.4.3 Stormwater Network Drainage Design

Following the Council (FNDC) standards and codes, the intent is to install a new drainage system, i.e. catchpits and pipes, to collect, convey and discharge the additional runoff into the existing stormwater pipelines where required due to the re-alignment of road kerbs and adding of SUP.

For this project, the drainage network will comply the following:

- Standard catchpit $460 \mathrm{~mm} \times 675 \mathrm{~mm}$, to have nominal inlet capacity of $201 / \mathrm{s}$ installed on relatively flat gradient.

As per FNDC minimum pipe should be of 300 mm in diameter for Stormwater. Flow master used to calculate the pipe sizes. Calculations shows that required pipe is far lesser than the 300 mm . Therefore, minimum pipe size ( 300 mm ) will be used for the SW pipes. (See snip below for Flow master calculation).

| Worksheet : Circular Pipe - @10yr |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ | 回 | x |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uniform Flow | Gradually Varied Flow (1) Messages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solve For: | Normal Depth |  | $\checkmark 2$ | Friction Method: Man |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Roughness Coefficient <br> Channel Slope: <br> Normal Depth: <br> Diameter: <br> Discharge: |  | 0.013 |  | Flow Area: | 0.0 |  | $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |
|  |  | 0.005 |  | Wetted Perimeter: | 0.5 |  | m |  |
|  |  | 172.5 | mm | Hydraulic Radius: | 81.5 |  | mm |  |
|  |  | 300.0 | mm | Top Width: | 0.30 |  | m |  |
|  |  | 43.00 |  | Critical Depth: | 160.0 |  | mm |  |
|  |  |  |  | Percent Full: | 57.5 |  | \% |  |
|  |  |  |  | Critical Slope: | 0.006 |  | $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{m}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Velocity: | 1.02 |  | m/s |  |
|  |  |  |  | Velocity Head: | 0.05 |  | m |  |
|  |  |  |  | Specific Energy: | 0.23 |  | m |  |
|  |  |  |  | Froude Number: | 0.867 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Maximum Discharge: | 73.55 |  | L/s |  |
|  |  |  |  | Discharge Full: | 68.38 |  | L/s |  |
|  |  |  |  | Slope Full: | 0.002 |  | $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{m}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Flow Type: | Subcritical |  |  |  |
| (i) Calculation Successful. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Location of Stormwater Network

Assuming (need to confirm at next stage of design) the number of existing utilities under the walkways/ SUP, proposed stormwater catchpits are positioned at the low points on carriageway. All the catchpits are connected to nearest existing manholes. (See General arrangement drawings for proposed Stormwater network).

The proposed stormwater catchpits are not aligned directly under the wheel path of the traffic within the carriageway, to reduce continuous fatigue loading on stormwater network.

### 4.4.4 Stormwater Quality Management

No treatment devices are being proposed for this project as it only have SUP (Shared User path). It is assumed that clean stormwater discharging from the SUP, which requires no treatment due to cycle and pedestrian usage only.

### 4.4.5 Stormwater Quantity Management

Due to the proximity of this project to the coastal area, no attenuation is proposed/requirement for the project.

### 4.4.6 Safety in Design

The stormwater design has considered Safety in Design (SID) as follows:

- During design, the drainage team has worked with the roading design team to develop safe and userfriendly solutions to minimise surface water depths and flow velocities across the carriage way including cycle and pedestrian spaces;
- Minimising ponding water area;
- Providing safe and shallow stormwater catchpit depths;
- Considering construction suitability with regards to the position and connections of catchpits where it is safe to block one lane with traffic management for vehicular access: and
- Considering public interaction with the stormwater system. For example, the proposed stormwater catchpits are not aligned directly under the wheel path of the traffic within the carriageway.


### 4.5 Next Steps

Following items require assessment during design development:

- Confirmation of the position and sizing of the network drainage system, as well as the connection of the new system into the existing network.
- Stakeholder consultation for approval (local council, iwi, and Waka Kotahi).


## 5 Utilities

### 5.1 Available Information

The utility service plans have been collated from Before-U-Dig application lodged in May 2021.
Top Energy plans have been requested from the service provider directly.
Co-ordination for as-built records/CAD data from network utility operators and site investigation to confirm asset location is to be carried out in the subsequent stage of design.

### 5.2 Design Criteria

### 5.2.1 Assumptions and Considerations

Based on the data received from BeforeUDig, existing services were assessed. It is anticipated that the proposed works will not affect the existing utilities under the existing eastbound footpath and berm of Marsden Road. However, confirmation of existing cover depths is required as potential lowering maybe
required for any shallow assets. Affected service lids will be adjusted to new SUP level as stated in drawings DRG-RR-0101-0104.

### 5.2.2 Methods and Management of Utility Works

Network utility relocation works is to be managed in subsequent design stage so that the installation, design, operation, maintenance and upgrade will be in compliance with the relevant standards, code of practice or guidelines in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential adverse effects on the health and safety of people and on the surrounding environment.

### 5.3 Design Development

Refer to attached Utilities register in Appendix F for collated Before-U-Dig plans and potential assessed effects. Any utilities affected by works resulting in level changes are to be replaced with new to maintain existing minimum cover levels in accordance with the standards. Where possible, minimum covers and minimum clearance to the utility assets will be provided. However, where this cannot be achieved, diversion of services or installation of protective slabs will be considered as part of the future design process.

Co-ordination with the NUO's in subsequent design stage is required to confirm location of assets and assess further impacts.

## 6 Contaminated Land Assessment

### 6.1 Background

The site is referenced in Drawing 511738-0000-DRG-RR-0101. A Contamination Assessment was conducted by Aurecon in 2019 (504164-2000-REP-KF-1001) as part of the State Highway 11 Single Stage Business Case (SSBC). The investigation was undertaken to provide a high-level assessment of the potential contamination issues that may impact on the intervention sites identified in the SSBC. The report included a general summary of the Paihia to Waitangi Shared User Pathway (SUP) project area and information gathered as part of that assessment has been included in this report where appropriate.

### 6.2 Northland Regional Council

Northland Regional Council (NRC) holds a database of sites that have, or have had in the past, an activity or industry that is detailed in the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) (MfE, 2012). This database information was reviewed on 28 June 2021 and the findings are summarised as:

- HAIL F7 (Service Stations): Waitomo Petroleum Service Station at 140 Marsden Road; and
- HAIL F4 (Motor vehicle workshop): JKL Auto at 140 Marsden Road.

These HAIL activities occur on the land immediately adjacent to the proposed Shared User Pathway alignment and have been recorded on NRC database as verified HAIL sites with no known investigations previously undertaken to quantify the risk levels.

It was also noted on the NRC database that the historical shoreline has been modified, indicating that land reclamation has occurred along the coast. This is predominantly within the grassed areas east of Marsden Road, as this area is subject to flooding and coastal erosion. The 50-year coastal erosion hazard zone is marked on the NRC database on the western side of Marsden Road, indicating that further work will be required to prevent coastal erosion.

### 6.3 Historical Aerial Photography

A review of publicly available historical aerial photography, available from Retrolens and Google Earth (accessed 28 June 2021) was undertaken. A summary of the findings is presented in Table 5.

Table 4 Summary of Historical Aerial Imagery

| Year and <br> Source | Site | Adjacent Area |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Retrolens | SH11 (Marsden Road) has <br> already been constructed, as well <br> as connected roads such as <br> Davis Crescent. There appears to <br> have been earthworks recently <br> undertaken at Nihonui Point, <br> including vegetation removal. <br> Marsden Road curves to the <br> south at the western end of the <br> site boundary. | There are a number <br> of residential <br> dwellings present <br> along Marsden Road. |  |
| 1968 | The earthworks at Nihonui Point <br> have been completed, with <br> Marsden Road following the <br> coastal boundary. The western <br> end of Marsden Road now further <br> extends to the west, towards <br> Waitangi, and a T-intersection is <br> present. | Additional residential <br> dwellings have been <br> constructed north of <br> the site, beyond the <br> new intersection. |  |


| $1981$ <br> Retrolens | The resolution is low in this aerial image. <br> No significant changes to the site are observed. | No significant changes to the surrounding area are observed. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 <br> Google Earth | The northern intersection, between Marsden Road and Te Karuwha Parade, has been modified to include a roundabout. <br> The service station at 140 Marsden Road has been upgraded, with the rear of the property being covered in hardstanding and vehicles. This indicates the auto-repair shop is likely present at this time. <br> A narrow, long building has been constructed immediately south of the service station. | Numerous residential dwellings in the surrounding area have been extended or rebuilt. Angled carparking has been constructed in some areas of the road. |  |
| 2020 <br> Google Earth | No significant changes to the site are observed. | No significant changes to the surrounding area are observed. |  |
| Summary | SH11 (Marsden Road) had been present prior to the first available aerial in 1951, with residential dwellings present to the south adjacent to it. SH11 was then further extended to Waitangi (west) in the 1960's and widened in the 1970's. A roundabout was constructed between 1980's to early 2000's, connecting Te Karuwha Parade to Marsden Road. | The area surrounding the proposed SUP alignment has historically consisted of residential dwellings, with commercial facilities constructed more recently. |  |

### 6.4 Site Walkover

A site walkover was conducted as part of the previous Contamination Assessment (504164-2000-REP-KF1001). The walkover identified HAIL activities outside the current study area, including electrical transformers, an off-pier service station (Marine stop) and a helicopter pad, as well as the service station at 140 Marsden Road

A review of historical Google Street View, dated 2010, shows the petrol station and vehicle workshop present at 140 Marsden Road under different branding with Shell Petrol and AA contractor signs visible. Additional signage changes to the Z Energy and ANTZ Automotive locations were observed in the 2013 Street View, before changing to the current property owners. The review did not identify any other potential HAIL activities along the proposed SUP alignment, however, it should be noted that the roading material may contain asphaltic compounds, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and this could impact soil disposal options.

### 6.5 Summary

This high-level desktop assessment has identified that HAIL activities have occurred within the immediately adjacent area. Specifically, there is the potential for petroleum activities (service station at 140 Marsden Road) and land reclamation along the coastal boundary to have impacted the soil and shallow groundwater.

It is recommended that a preliminary site investigation (PSI) is conducted to understand the potential impact of the petroleum activity undertaken in the area including both the service station and the marine stop and associated underground pipework. Furthermore, it is recommended that a detailed site investigation (DSI) is also conducted to understand the type of filling historically undertaken in connection with the reclamation, and if the identified HAIL activities have impacted the soil and shallow groundwater.

Based on the findings of the DSI, a Contaminated Site Management Plan (CSMP) may be required to be implemented during the re-development works.

All additional environmental investigations, reporting and risk management planning activities should be undertaken by a Suitably Qualified Environmental Practitioner (SQEP) as required by the National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES CS).

## 7 Next Steps

As part of the next design phase the following items are recommended to be undertaken in consultation with Waka Kotahi:

1. Undertake a Preliminary Design Stage Road Safety Audit and agree any amendments to the recommended design as a result of this process
2. Consultation with utility operators to confirm presence of utilities under the proposed SUP footprint and any relevant effects
3. Community engagement on the proposed layout and parking changes and alignment with FNDC Parking Management Strategy (once completed)
4. Recommendations from the SiD register attached in Appendix H is to be considered in subsequent design stage
5. Deliver Detailed Design and Outline Plan of Works and any associated consents.
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## Technical Note

| Project | SH11 Paihia to Waitangi SUP | Reference No. | 511738-0000-TEQ-CC-0001 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To | Warren Feek, Tim Elliot | From | Pieu Nalin |
| Date | 14/05/2021 | Pages (including <br> this page) | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| Subject | Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement - Design Criteria |  |  |

## 1 Project Description

A Shared Use Path (SUP) is proposed from Nihonui Point to Te Karuwha Parade along the coastal edge of Paihia. The installation of a SUP between Paihia and Waitangi will create a direct link between the two towns for active transport modes and provide an attractive cycle route and pedestrian walkway along the coast to accommodate the high number of tourists travelling to and from the town centre. Currently, the existing Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail (TCCT) links Kawakawa to Opua. This is to be extended from Opua to Paihia via Russell under the Northland Integrated Walking and Cycling Implementation Plan. The SH11 Single Stage Business Case (SSBC) proposed to extend this connection from Paihia and Waitangi. Once these connections are completed, the SUP will form part of the TCCT and will support the increase in cyclists expected in the region.

Refer to the extents of work shown in Figure 5-2, along SH11 Marsden Road, connecting the Paihia Waterfront Development design from the north of Nihonui point to south of the roundabout with Te Karuwha Parade.


Figure 1: Project Extent of Paihia to Waitangi SUP

## 2 Purpose

This technical note forms as an amendment to the SH11 - Single Stage Business Case Preliminary Design Philosophy Statement (PDPS), Reference: 504164-2000-REP-JJ-1040, Revision C, 2019-1002. This technical note has been prepared to identify, present and agree design considerations, parameters, standards, key criteria and considerations that will be used to inform the preliminary design of the project.

As the design development is undertaken, the design report will be updated and any departures and changes as agreed with Waka Kotahi and FNDC will be presented in the design report.

## 3 Design Inputs and Assumptions

The preliminary design will be developed on the following key assumptions:

- Minimal modification to existing kerb alignment (reduced utilities and tree removal impact). Kerb alterations will be required where the SUP is achieved through widening of existing footpath into angled and parallel parking towards the carriageway.
- Fixed road corridor width (no property acquisition)
- It is anticipated that maintaining the existing footpath edge on the coastal side of Marsden Road is sufficient to maintain the health of the existing Pohutukawa trees. This will be confirmed as per the arboriculture assessment
- Some loss of parking along the beach front will be required to achieve desirable SUP widths
- Minimal changes to existing road geometry maybe required to accommodate sufficient parking widths. This will be in accordance with design standards outlined in Section 4.
- The proposed design will tie-into the existing footpath prior to the roundabout with Te Karuwha Parade and into the existing footpath prior to the bend at Nihnui Point as part of the project extents.
- No changes to the existing footpath along northbound lane of Marsden Road is proposed as part of this project scope


## 4 Design Standards

The relevant standards which have been referenced include:

- Far North District Council Engineering Standards \& Guidelines 2009
- Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017
- Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 3, 2017
- Manual of Traffic Signs and Markings (MOTSAM) (NZ Transport Agency, 2010)
- Christchurch Cycle Design Guidelines, 2016
- Shared Space in Urban Environments Guidance Note, 2012


## 5 Design Philosophy

The design values adopted within this design philosophy are the intended desirable values for the ultimate design solution. However, it is likely that in some locations these values may not be feasible or practical to achieve. These situations will be highlighted and departures from standards will be applied for through the appropriate Departure Request process to the Waka Kotahi and Far North District Council (FNDC).

The proposed works are intended to create a safe, compliant and efficient road and improve the overall function of the adjoining road networks where affected. The design will not exacerbate any existing design deficiencies and will attempt to improve or remove existing deficiencies, where practicable. It is noted that due to the existing geometry and physical constraints, improvements to meet current standards or desirable level of service will not always be possible and any increases in traffic volumes can exacerbate existing issues

As far as practicable, the geometry of existing roads and services will be retained, and it is noted that it is not the intention of this project to change the risk profile of associated infrastructure.

The general design philosophy for the proposed SUP is that the desirable width will be achieved by removal of angled parking where possible. Where there are Pohutukawa Trees, the existing footpath edge will be retained dependent on arboriculture assessment. Where there is no parking available to utilise for SUP width, existing footpath will be widened towards the coastal edge. Due to the change in grade between the existing footpath and the beach, a balance of achievable SUP width without significant earthworks will be required to achieve the agreed programme and project costs.

## 6 Design Criteria

### 6.1 Road Classification

Table 1: Road Classification

| Road Name | Road Classification | ONRC (AADT) | \% Heavy Vehicles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | ONRC | 4780 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Marsden Road | Primary Collector | 1745 | $6 \%$ |
| Te Karuwha Parade | Secondary Collector |  |  |

As per the Northland Regional Council CityLink Bus Service Map, Marsden Road is a bus route.
As per Waka Kotahi's Twin Coast Discovery Route and Northland Journeys, Northland Integrated Cycling Implementation Plan Preliminary Design and Delivery document, 5 June 2019, Marsden Road is on the Te Araroa Trail as shown in the figure below:


Figure 2: Northland Integrated Walking and Cycling Implementation Plan

As per the Twin Coast Cycle Trail - Pou Herenga Tai, Marsden Road is a missing gap in the cycle trail network.

### 6.2 Design Speed

The existing speed along Marsden Road is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$. The design speed along Marsden Road is $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$. This is the state highway posted speed of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ plus $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ which will be used as a fair approximation for the design.

As per Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, it is recommended that paths be designed for a speed of at least $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ wherever possible and desirable given the purpose of the path, and in other cases for the anticipated operating speeds. However, it should be recognised that it may be necessary to adopt higher or lower design speeds in specific circumstances.

### 6.3 Typical Cross Section

### 6.3.1 General Lane widths and crossfall

Urban freeway widths as according to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 3: Geometric Design.

Table 2: General lane width and crossfall criteria

| Element | Value | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Traffic Lane width | 3.5 | $3.0-3.4 \mathrm{~m}$ for low speed roads with low truck volumes |
| Asphalt type pf pavement crossfall \% | $2.5-3.0$ | Although no change to existing carriageway geometry is <br> proposed, where there is widening of footpath into the <br> road (through removal of angled parking) the existing <br> crossfall of the road will be tied into the SUP. |
| Portland cement concrete \% | $2.0-3.0$ |  |

### 6.3.2 Shared Use Path

## Cross - Section

As per the concept design tech note 504164-2000-TEC-JJ-1024 a desirable 4.0 m wide SUP was suggested. Without significant changes to the corridor geometry, utilities and existing constraints such as trees and parking, this cannot be accommodated throughout the project extents.

According to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017 a 2.5 - 3.0 m wide SUP is suggested for up to 900 two-way per peak hour cyclists and 100 two-way per peak hour pedestrians as per the figure below:


Figure 3: SUP width for a $50 / 50$ directional split

According to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017, the acceptable widths for a SUP are:
Table 3: SUP width criteria

|  | Suggested Path Width (m) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Local Access Path | Regional Path | Recreational Path |
| Desirable Minimum Width | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| Minimum Width - Typical Maximum | $2.0-3.0$ | $2.5-4.0$ | $3.0-4.0$ |

The lower boundary should only be adopted where cyclist volumes and operational speeds will remain low. The upper boundary may be required where the numbers of cyclists and pedestrians are very high or there is a high probability of conflict between users (e.g. people walking dogs, in-line skaters etc.).

A local access path is provided to connect a local area to a community facility, regional path is considered to be on the principal bicycle network and recreational path is considered for regular use.

Furthermore, according to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017, Appendix A.2, 2.5 m are absolute minimum widths for paths having a predominant purpose of commuting and recreation respectively.

Hence, the designer suggests adopting a desirable width of $3.0-4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ wide SUP where feasible and a minimum of 2.5 m wide SUP where there are constraints in terms of road geometry, protected trees and utilities.

## SUP Crossfall

The crossfall of the proposed SUP will be guided by the existing footpath crossfall. Any alterations will be in accordance with the design requirements outlined below.

According to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017, Section 5.6.1, water ponding on paths has a significant impact on the level of service provided to cyclists as spray leads to grit on both bicycle and rider and pedestrians, who may have to travel off the path to avoid the ponded water. On straight sections crowning of the pavement is preferable as it results in less accumulation of debris. On sealed surfaces a crossfall of $2-4 \%$ should be adequate to effectively dispose of surface water whereas unsealed surfaces may require $5 \%$ to prevent puddles of water from developing.

## SUP Iongitudinal Gradient

Existing longitudinal gradient of the footpath and road will be followed.

## SUP Clearance

As per Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017, Figure 5.7 a 2.5 m vertical clearance and 1.0 m (absolute minimum of 0.5 m ) horizontal clearance envelope is suggested.

## Bicycle Parking

Bicycle parking facilities maybe investigated in consultation with Waka Kotahi. Any new bicycle parking facility will be in accordance with AS 2890.3:2015

### 6.3.3 Separated Paths

Due to the existing placement of trees along the road corridor, there may be areas where separated path from a SUP may be required. This will be designed based on the following criteria as per Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A, 2017, Section 5.1.5

Table 4: Separated two-way path width

|  | Suggested Path Width (m) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bicycle path | Pedestrian Path | Total |
| Desirable Minimum Width | 2.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |
| Minimum Width - Typical Maximum | $2.0-3.0$ | $>=1.5$ | $>=4.5$ |

Table 5: Separated one-way path widths

|  | Suggested Path Width (m) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bicycle path | Pedestrian Path | Total |
| Desirable Minimum Width | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 |
| Minimum Width - Typical Maximum | 1.2 | $>=1.2$ | $>=2.4$ |

A minimum width of 2.0 m is required where passing within the cyclist path section occurs or where it is desirable that passing manoeuvres by cyclists outside of the pedestrian path section of the facility.

### 6.4 Parking

Roadside parking along SH11 (Marsden Road) and Te Karuwha Parade is provided for through a mixture of parallel and angled parking spaces along the coastal edge. With the widening of the SUP, existing angular parking spots and parallel parking spots will be affected. As per discussions with FNDC, it was identified that a parking policy document in line with the new National Parking Management Guidance is in its' draft stage. A separate parking assessment tech note will be issued.

The design of the affected parking spots will be undertaken in accordance with the Far North District Plan, Appendix 3D as per the table below:

Table 6: Manoeuvring and Parking Space Dimensions

| Parking Angle | Width of Parking <br> Space $(\mathbf{m})$ | Kerb Overhang (m) | Depth of Parking <br> Space $(\mathbf{m})$ | Manoeuvring <br> Spaces $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90^{\circ}$ Casual Users | 2.5 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 8.1 |
|  | 2.6 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 7.1 |
|  | 2.7 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
|  | $>2.75$ | 1.0 | 4.9 | 6.6 |
|  | 2.5 | 1.0 | 5.2 | 4.1 |


| Parking Angle | Width of Parking <br> Space $(\mathbf{m})$ | Kerb Overhang (m) | Depth of Parking <br> Space $(\mathbf{m})$ | Manoeuvring <br> Spaces $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $45^{\circ}$ | $>2.75$ | 1.0 | 5.2 | 3.2 |
|  | 2.5 | 0.8 | 4.9 | 2.7 |
|  | 2.6 | 0.8 | 4.9 | 2.5 |
| $30^{\circ}$ | 2.7 | 0.8 | 4.9 | 2.4 |
|  | $>2.7$ | 0.8 | 4.9 | 2.3 |
| Parallel | 2.5 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 2.4 |
|  | 2.6 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 2.4 |
|  | $>2.75$ | 0.6 | 4.0 | 2.3 |
|  | 5.9 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 2.3 |
|  | 6.1 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 3.6 |
|  | 6.3 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 3.3 |

### 6.5 Kerb and channel

All existing kerb and channel will be retained where possible.
In discussion with FNDC, it has been concluded that the council do not require additional stormwater treatment from the intended proposed SUP. Any changes to the existing stormwater network will be relocated and replaced like for like. Proposed kerbs will match existing or suit the road scenario.

### 6.6 Handrail

The design anticipates to not affect any existing fence or handrails along the project extents. However, during the design development if any such infrastructure is affected, a like to like replacement will be proposed.

### 6.7 Signage

Any new proposed signage will be in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 5.1.2. SUP signage will be located on the coastal side of the SUP. Traffic signs shall be located on the left-hand of traffic lane. The locations of signs and posts shall take into consideration potential obstructions of trees and amenities and minimum setbacks from kerbs.

Mounting heights shall comply with Waka Kotahi and FNDC requirements, where the clearance is defined as the vertical distance measured from the underside of the sign to the highest level of the surface of the carriageway.

### 6.8 Pavement Marking

Pavement markings will be designed in accordance with the standards outlined in Section 5.1.2.
The design of the road and SUP markings shall be developed in accordance with applicable standards to ensure a safe and intuitive layout consistent with the surrounding road network.

The line marking design shall tie into the existing markings at the limit of works. Removal of redundant road marking shall be done to standard, so no evidence of old marking exists.

### 6.9 Utilities

B4UDig plans with a desktop assessment will be issued following the submission of this document. In general, it is anticipated that minimal effect to existing utilities will be proposed. General management strategy is to protect existing utilities if under the proposed SUP. Any utilities requiring relocation (shallow cover depths or on-ground assets) will be highlighted in the B4UDig plans and are to be further assessed in subsequent design stages.

Approved by:

| Title | Name | Position | Signature | Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Author | Pieu Nalin | Senior Engineer | P_alin | 14/05/2021 |
| Reviewer | Martyn Francis | Associate |  | $14 / 05 / 2021$ |

## Appendix B

Drawings

| Drawing No. / Doc Code | Title |
| :---: | :---: |
| 511738-000-PRG-CC.0011 | drawng index |
| 511738-000-PRGEEE-0101 | Lightng Lavout Plan - Sheet 1 |
| 511738-000-PRGEEE-0102 | LIGHTING LaYOUT PLAN - SHEET 2 |
| 511738-000-PRGEEE-0103 | LGhting Lavout plan - Sheet 3 |
| 511738-0000-PRGEEE-0104 | LIGHTING LaYOUT PLAN - SHEet 4 |
| 511738-000-PRG-RR-010 | General ArRangement - Sheet 10 O 4 |
| 511738-000-PRG-RR-0102 | GENERAL ARAANGEmENT SHEET 2 Of 4 |
| 511738-000-PRG-RR-0103 | GENERAL ARAANGEMENT- SHEET 3 Of 4 |
| 511738-0000-PRG:RR-0104 | GENERALARRANGEMENT- SHEET 4 OF 4 |
| 511738-000-PRG-RR-0301 | Cross sections - SHEET 1 |
| 511738-0000-PRG:RR-.3302 | Cross sections - SHEET 2 |













## Appendix C

Parking Impacts Assessment and capacity of surrounding carparks

## Technical Note

| To | Warren Feek, Tim Elliot | From | Lupesina Koro |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Copy | Pieu Nalin | Reference | $\mathbf{5 1 1 7 3 8}$ |
| Date | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2 - 0 1 - 2 1}$ | Pages <br> (including this page) | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Subject | Parking capacity impact assessment |  |  |

## 1 Purpose

This parking assessment assesses the existing parking provision on State Highway 11 (SH11), Marsden Road between Nihonui point and Te Karuwha Parade, and the available capacity of the surrounding network, mainly the nearest local road, Davis Crescent, as shown in Figure 1. Parking capacity has been estimated using dimensions according to FNDC standards.
It is necessary to assess the carpark capacity of surrounding areas because the proposed design for the Paihia to Waitangi shared user path (SUP) will result in a reduction in car parking spaces. This assessment was completed outside of the peak season, when there are fewer visitors to the Bay of Islands therefore is primarily desktop based and a car park occupancy study was not undertaken Anecdotal evidence from prior engagement with stakeholders during the development of the SH11 SSBC suggested that parking demand can exceed existing supply in the summer months..

## 2 Existing situation

At present there are 89 parking spaces available on the eastbound (seaward) side of SH 11 as outlined in red in Figure 1. There are no time restrictions on these spaces.

The road is marked no stopping at all times in the westboud direction with the exception of in front of the local shops which is marked P 10 ( $8: 00-17: 00,7$ days). There is space for approximately 3 vehicles.


Figure 1: SH11 Marsden Road and Davis Crescent (Source: https://data.linz.govt.nz/data/)

## áurecon

The provision of parking along Davis Cresecent includes:

- 21 P30 angled parking spaces
- 12 perpendicular parking spaces (no time limit)
- On street kerb-side parking (estimated space for 40-50 vehicles)

Typically the land parcels around Davis Crescent are large in size and have off-street car parking facilities. The properties are a mixture of commercial and residential, as outlined in the Consenting Strategy, July 2021. There are 8 accommodation sites, a mixture of hotels and motels on both SH11 and Davis Crescent, and each of which have off-street parking facilities.

The following observations were made from various visits to the site:

- A number of the car parking spaces are occupied by freedom camping vehicles and motorhomes
- Vehicles with boat trailers commonly park for a short stay either across the westbound angle parks or in the P10 westbound spaces to purchase bait and supplies from the suprette.

The area is not listed on Far North District Council's responsible free camping sites ${ }^{1}$ however as SH11, Marsden Road is designated a state highway, FNDC council officers cannot enforce parking controls on the state highway.


Figure 2: Existing parking on Davis Crescent

[^1]
## 3 Proposed

The preliminary design for the Paihia to Waitangi SUP includes reducing the 89 parks on SH11 to 31. A reduction of $65 \%$ (refer to section 2.4 .5 of the Preliminary Deisgn Report). Based on this desktop assessment of Davis Crescent, there is latent capacity to absorb this loss in parking capacity on SH11, albeit slightly further (100m) away from the beach.

FNDC indicated that a car parking strategy for the area is due to commence and will be aligned with the National Parking Management Guidance, 2020 produced by Waka Kotahi. It is unknown if this will also consider parking on the state highways or only local roads managed by FNDC as the road controlling authority.

There are two additional sites which could be considered in future stages to provide additional parking capacity to supplement that removed for the SUP, if required. However, noting that these are both FNDC properties and therefore outside of Waka Kotahi control.


Figure 3: Additional parking provision sites

## 4 Next steps

Parking is important for visitors and locals alike and ensures people can access and enjoy the amenity of Te Tii beach. In future stages of the project the following should be considered:

1. Engagement with local businesses to understand the requirements for their staff and customers
2. Public engagement to gather community sentiment towards the shared user path and potential reduction in parking on SH 11
3. Engagement with accommodation providers to understand how many parking spaces they have for their guests and if any require on-street parking for overflow purposes
4. Review of the existing time restrictions and management of the car parking spaces on Davis Crescent, do these meet the needs of the local community and visitors
5. Parking provision for larger vehicles such as motor homes and those towing boats.
6. Car park occupancy survey in high season to collect data on use and duration of stay.

| Version | Date | Description | Author | Reviewer | Approver |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | $2021-07-04$ | Draft | L. Koro | C. Kenworthy | C. Kenworthy |
| 1 | $2022-01-21$ | FINAL | L. Koro | C. Kenworthy | C. Kenworthy |

## Appendix D

Lighting Calculations





## Appendix E

Risk Register

## SH11 Paihia to Waitangi SUP - Risk Register



## SH11 Paihia to Waitangi SUP - Risk Register




## Appendix F

Utilities Register

UTILITIES TRACKER

| Utilities | Plans | Location | Effects |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chorus | Received | Chorus telephone ducts and service pit under the eastbound footpath/berm of Marsden Road | Minimal effects anticipated from widening of the existing footpath to a SUP. Protection maybe required during construction depending on the existing depth of the cables. Further investigations and co-ordination with stakeholder required in subsequent design stage to confirm location of asset and existing cover depths |
|  |  | Chorus telephone ducts under the westbound footpath/berm of Marsden Road | No effect |
| LINZ | Received |  | NA |
| Water | Resourced from: <br> https://fndc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/in dex.html? id=9b351ce681e34ec29443ae1a6468cc2c | Water network under the westbound footpath of Marsden Road | No effect |
| Wastewater | Resourced from: <br> https://fndc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/in dex.html? ${ }^{\text {id }=9 b 351 c e 681 e 34 e c 29443 a e 1 a 6468 c c 2 c ~}$ | Wastewater network under Marsden Road carriageway with service covers at the roundabout with Te Karuwha Parade | No effect |
| Top Energy | Received | HV cable under the eastbound footpath/berm of Marsden Road | Widening of footpath to SUP may result in protection or lowering of ducts to maintain cover depths. Further investigations and co-ordination with stakeholder required to confirm location of asset and existing cover depths |
|  |  | LV cables under the westbound footpath of Marsden Road | No effect |
| Footpath amenity lighting | FNDC advised they do not have any cabling plans for these as these are footpath amenity lights | Along the southbound footpath of Marsden Road | To be relocated/upgraded with SUP lighting as part of the design. Refer to lighting plans DRG-EE-0101 to 0104 |

Note:
This list is not exhaustive. Assets have been obtained from B4UDig website, Far North District Council GIS and Top Energy
Further co-ordination with relevant network utility operators is required to confirm location of assets and assess affects against design in subsequent design stage
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## Appendix G

Arborist Assessment Report



## ARBORICULTURAL ASSESSMENT

| Site: | Paihia to Waitangi SUP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prepared for: | Aurecon NZ Ltd |
| Purpose: | Arboricultural assessment - construction of SUP adjacent to <br> pohutukawa trees on the Paihia beachfront. |
| Author: | Gerard Mostert |
| Date: | 1 July 2021 |

## 1. Introduction

Peers Brown Miller has been engaged by Aurecon NZ Ltd to provide an arborist's assessment of proposed shared use path (SUP) works adjacent to pohutukawa trees along the Paihia beachfront. It is intended that this assessment will assist the process of design and construction of the SUP.

## Summary of the contents of this report:

- The trees in question are mostly healthy
- Saltwater intrusion will adversely affect these trees in the next few decades
- The path cannot be constructed too close to the trees as this is bad for tree health. Cuts adjacent to the trees should be avoided.
- The path cannot be constructed too close to the trees as root action will lift and crack the path in the short term.
- There needs to be scope for insets in the path where too close to trees.
- The conflicts with trees are limited in number.
- Tree protection will rely on proper supervision at path construction stage - there will need to be some flexibility to amend the design on site.


## 2. Situation

There is an existing concrete footpath along the Paihia beachfront which is about 1.5 m wide. This path is close to the end of its service life, and is also too narrow to meet the reasonable engineering specifications of a SUP, which is intended to carry both bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

The existing path passes close to many of the pohutukawa trees, to the extent that the concrete is often in firm contact with their trunks.

Most of the trees are in good overall health. Pohutukawa trees are generally tolerant of root constraints as they often grow in rocky, dry or nutrient-poor coastal environments. They are also tolerant of salty environments, since they are frequently found just above the high tide mark, as is the case here.

Regardless of their saltwater tolerance there are signs that some trees are being adversely affected by saltwater intrusion. This shows up as stress response (epicormic) growth in the crowns, and also through direct undercutting or exposure of the roots by wave action on the seaward side of the trees. The existing path also shows signs of being undercut by wave action in places.

## 3. Reference materials

This report is based upon the following plans entitled:

- SH11 Paihia to Waitangi - General Arrangement Sheets 1-4, Drawings 5117380000 DRG RR 0101 - 0104 by Aurecon for Waka Kotahi.
- SH11 Paihia to Waitangi - Cross Sections Sheet 1, Drawing 5117380000 DRG RR 0301 by Aurecon for Waka Kotahi.


## 4. Method

I made a site visit on 11 June 2021 and inspected the trees in the company of Pieu Nalin, Senior Engineer, Aurecon Ltd. Pieu was able to brief me about the various engineering constraints of the proposal.

I took photographs of all the trees and made a brief assessment of their health. I measured the distance between the tree trunks and the nearest obstruction, which was in all cases the edge of the existing concrete footpath, unless there was no obstruction at all (for example, trees growing in open ground far away from the path).

This assessment focusses on the conflict between tree roots and the existing and proposed paths, so an estimate of tree size was sufficient in the context of the brief.

### 4.1 Deliverables

My site data is provided in three appendices:

- Appendix 1

A set of marked-up site plans with the trees numbered for reference in this report.

- Appendix 2

A set of numbered tree photographs with captions

## - Appendix 3

A table of tree data / constraints / comments.

## 5. Statutory Framework - Tree Protection

I have not commented on the statutory framework. I will address this if required for consenting purposes. This report is framed in purely arboricultural terms.

## 6. Arboricultural Assessment

The trees under discussion appear to be part of an even-aged planting. The trees are between 7 and 12 m in height and 8 and 15 m in crown spread. The trees have multiple trunks in all cases, as is typical of pohutukawa, and approximate aggregate girths between 1.5 and 4 m .

As noted above, the trees stand on the crest of the bank above high tide mark and are susceptible to saltwater intrusion. Even under these difficult conditions the trees still appear to be in good overall health. Defects of overall health are limited to twiggy dieback in some trees, as well as some dense epicormic growth in the more stressed trees.

Many of the trees have restricted root run due to the path passing to the south of the tree trunks.

Collectively speaking, the trees have considerable amenity value and serve to frame the walkway along the beach. The species choice is also appropriate to the coastal environment.

## 7. Discussion

### 7.1 Typical growth pattern of pohutukawa trees

Pohutukawa trees are known to develop substantial roots, so a rootplate of between 10 and 20 m radius is easily possible. Pohutukawa trees usually extend their roots on the landwards and uphill side of the tree, as an adaptation to growing on the coast. Water and nutrients are predominantly obtained on the landward side of the tree since the seaward environment is too salty to allow extensive root growth.

As a rule of thumb, about $95 \%$ of tree roots are found in the top metre of the soil profile, and $65 \%$ within the top 30 cm of the soil. It is thus crucial to avoid soil disturbance, particularly close to the tree in the zone of rapid root taper (RRT).

### 7.2 The impact of path construction on tree health

I have assessed the impact of the existing and proposed paths on the health of the trees, and have made recommendations for their protection during SUP construction, as follows:

### 7.2.1 Proximity to the tree trunks

The existing path is in many places too close to the trunks of the trees to be sustainable, for the following reasons:

- Trees produce strong hydraulic forces as their roots swell (when water is available). This can happen quickly - pohutukawa has the capacity to imbibe large amounts of water. The roots swell rapidly - sometimes overnight - and can displace large structures and crack concrete.


Fig 1 - The buttress roots of this tree have lifted the concrete footpath (creating a trip hazard)

- The tree trunks are a practical overhead obstacle close to the path, i.e. it is possible to ride or walk into some of the trees because they intrude slightly into the path (similar to the trees along Tamaki Drive in Auckland).
- $\quad$ Cutting down (lowering grade) immediately adjacent to the tree often results in direct root damage and compromise tree health overall (See Fig 3 below).


Fig 2 - Getting too close to the tree puts pedestrians - and particularly cyclists - at risk of an overhead impact with the trunk.


Fig 3 - Schematic of the relationship between a path and tree roots. The tree roots are relatively shallow and tend to invade the base course under paths. It is very important to avoid any significant cut in the vicinity of the red arrow, as this could cause direct damage to the roots. If the path is too close to the tree at this point, root action will lift the path.

### 7.2.2 Bridging

As an alternative to moving the path laterally away from the roots, it may in some instances be possible to bridge over the roots, i.e. to avoid the rootplate vertically rather than horizontally.


Fig 4 - Tree root bridging detail from Auckland Transport's Code of Practice 2008/0622.

## 8. Recommendations

It is recommended that the path edge is kept a minimum distance of 50 cm (laterally) away from the tree trunks. This is less than ideal - further is better - but is a response to the existing conditions, where the width available is constrained by the road. Keeping away from the trunk and buttress roots will prevent the trees from lifting the path through direct root action, and also limits the impact of the path on the health of tree roots, allowing some air and water to permeate into the ground along the path edge. It also reduces the risk of overhead impact.

If this cannot be achieved, then a cutaway in the path edge can be used as a viable alternative (as was done previously, See Fig 3).

### 8.1 Site works

Regardless of the degree of design, it is difficult to predict exactly what will be found when the existing path is broken up and removed. Changes may need to be made on the spot to the details of the design in order to accommodate existing large roots, or to achieve the necessary grade.

Similarly to the general construction recommendations, roots can be retained by hand digging to remove loose organic material, covering the surface with geotextile cloth, laying gap / aggregate / crusher run to form a level surface, and casting the concrete in place on top.

## 9. Mitigation

To avoid disturbing the roots of the trees, the following construction method is recommended, where possible:

- Break up and remove the existing concrete, using a digger standing on the existing path and peeling it back. Machine movements on open ground should be avoided as this causes compaction.
- Lay geotextile cloth over the remaining basecourse and any exposed roots to reduce the possibility of root drying and concrete contamination.
- Place the new base course on top of the existing base course without disturbing the existing base course, and compact to specification.
- Haunch and cast the concrete surface on top of the existing base course.
- Keep the edge of the path closest to the tree at least 0.5 m away from the trunk (for the reasons given in 7.2).
- Avoid digging down into the existing basecourse as this is likely to be full of roots. If this has to be done, it should be done by hand under arborist supervision.
- No cuts (i.e. no lowered grade) should be permitted below existing ground level adjacent to any tree on the treeward side of the path. The existing basecourse can be left in place after concrete removal and the path grade built up on top of that.
- All excavation within the rootplate / dripline of any pohutukawa tree should be directly supervised by a competent works arborist. The works arborist should specify the excavation method to be used to avoid damage to roots, which may include hand excavation or supervised machine excavation, or a combination of the two.


## 10. Summary and conclusion

This report covers the practical arboricultural assessment of works within the dripline / protected rootzone of pohutukawa trees adjacent to the Paihia to Waitangi SUP.

Twenty trees were surveyed. The trees are shown in the appendices below. The colours used below refer to Table 1.

## Green category

Twelve trees are located sufficiently far from the existing / proposed path edge that works are likely to be successful without any significant damage to the trees.

## Orange category

Four trees appear to have sufficient separation from the path edge for the works to be undertaken, but further exploration will be necessary during path construction as the situation is unclear.

## Yellow category

Four trees require modifications to the path to achieve greater separation from the proposed path, either through the use of insets / cutaways, bridging, or redesign of the entire path.

With care and proper arboricultural supervision, the SUP can be constructed without significant adverse effects on the environment.

Ghorect
Gerard Mostert - Consultant
Peers Brown Miller Ltd
1 July 2021

Appendix 1 - Tree table

| $\#$ | Distance <br> from extg. <br> path edge | Photo | Comment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2.5 | Tree 1 | Trunk base below grade. Sufficient separation from path edge. Fence posts will require hand excavation to miss <br> tree roots. |
| 2 | 3 | Tree 2 | Sufficient separation from trunk. |
| 3 | 0 | Tree 3 | Requires additional lateral separation from trunk (v. close at present, has lifted path). |
| 4 | 0 | Tree 4 | Requires additional lateral separation from trunk. Inset may be required. |
| 5 | 2 | Tree 5 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 6 | 1.1 | Tree 6 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 7 | $>10$ | Tree 7 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 8 | $>10$ | Tree 8 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 9 | $>6$ | Tree 9 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 10 | 1.3 | Tree 10 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 11 | 0.4 | Tree 11 | Appears to have sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 12 | $1 / 1$ | Tree 12 | Sufficient separation from path edge. |
| 13 | $0.1 / 1$ | Tree 13 | Appears to have sufficient separation from path edge |
| 14 | 0.5 | Tree 14 | Appears to have sufficient separation from path edge |
| 15 | 0.6 | Tree 15 | Sufficient separation. Bridged - grate with fill under path. Replace with gabion basket or similar? |
| 16 | 1.2 | Tree 16 | Appears to have sufficient separation from path edge |
| 17 | 0 | Tree 17 | Will require inset in path edge |
| 18 | 0 | Tree 18 | Will require inset in path edge |
| 19 | 0.8 | Tree 19 | Sufficient separation. |
| 20 | $>1$ | Tree 20 | Sufficient separation. |
| Table 1 - Tree data. The distances from the path edge refer to the existing path. I have also referred to the proposed plans, so my |  |  |  |
| comments reflect required changes to the proposed path. Colour-coding is as follows: |  |  |  |
| Sufficient separation, design appears adequate for tree protection |  |  |  |
| Appears to have sufficient separation, but will require excavation / kerb removal to check clearance |  |  |  |
| Requires specific intervention to protect the adjacent tree |  |  |  |

Appendix 2 - Tree photographs
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Tree 6


Trees 7, 8, 9 (from right to left)


Tree 10
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Appendix 3 - Tree plans (numbered as per report)


My mark-up of GA Sheet 0101


My mark-up of GA Sheet 0102


My mark-up of GA Sheet 0103


My mark-up of GA Sheet 0104

## Appendix H

Safety in Design Register

| IDENTIFY SAFE DESIGN RISK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SH11 P2W Safety in Design Workshop ASSESSMENT SAFE DESICN RISK－CURRENT EXPOSURE |  |  |  |  |  | IMPLEMENT SAFE DESICN RISK TREATMENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Risk Title | Event／Cause／Consequence | Persons Aficted | Applicable Phases | Applicable <br> Disciplines | Applicable WBSs |  | （Risk Treatment） Current Control Measures |  |  | 砍 |  |  | $\underset{\text { Action }}{\substack{\text { Risk Treatment）} \\ \text { Action Sumary }}}$ | Comments |
| 1 | Tree exposure，tree branch overhanging | Tree branches overhanging results in <br> －reduced lateral clearance to the tree for cyclists and other SUP users －increase in potential head－on accidents with the trees and／or other users Operating equipment under the tree canopy at risk of striking the tree －Insufficient visibility of the road features，signage and oncoming －Lower reliability of the SUP cyclists／pedestrians | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Path Users } \\ \text { Local Communities } \\ \text { and III } \\ \text { Constructors } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Design } \\ \text { Operations } \\ \text { Construction } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Roads \& } \\ \text { Highways } \\ \text { Environmentaa } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： Root barrier protection designed： Providing clear sightlines； <br> specifying removal of overhanging tree branches on the SUP in the design philosophy statement（DPS） －specifying Regular trimming and inspections of branch health in the DPS | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{e}{c} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a site based engineering service during别 Highlighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen －Discussing a proactive approach with local Council and fund maintenance |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ | Tree Root Damage | Damage to the tree roots along the road corridor due to construction activities resulting in death of trees | Local Communities and IW Maintaners Contstuctors Demolishers | Maintenance Construction Demolition | Environmental |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level through design： <br> －Build on top of the existing basecourse－cutting only 50 mm deep from existing ground levels in consultation with the arborist <br> －Consider wooden boardwalk instead of concrete in next stage of design <br> －Prepare arboricultural assessment report before construction <br> Ensure the presence of arborist on site during construction works －Specifying hand excavations when excavating near trees | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{e}{\vdots} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Offering to provide a site based engineering service during construction； <br> －Highlighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen |  |
| 3 | Tree Pruning | Pruning NZ native tree，such as Pohutukawa trees can cause temporary operational issues and legal issues： <br> temporary unaccessible to the closed path <br> might intrude the tree significance | Maintainers Path Users | Operations | Environmental |  | 嘓 | The risk has been controlled to the current level by －Consultation with Arborist and specifying local Iwi and Council consultation to confirm tree significance（cultural historic，archaeological） | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{b}{k} \\ \stackrel{y}{2} \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  | 3 |  | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a site based engineering service from the arborist during construction to trim the rota where feasible |  |
| 4 | Construction period coincide with the flowering season | Construction works period happen at the same time as pohutukawa flowering period can make surface finish poor． | Constructors | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { obè } \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Specifying to programme the construction process：heat for curing／cracking etc．wisely to avoid the flowering period |  |  | 镸 |  | － | The risk will be a actioned to an acceptable level by： during construction； <br> Robust TTaffic Manin the construction methodology statemen <br> ust Traffic Management Plan |  |
| 5 | Slippery Surface | Fallen leaves（wet from the rain）could cause accidents for cyclists in the SUP lane | Path Users Maintainers | Maintenance Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 戔 } \\ & \dot{~} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{e}{c} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 噰 } \\ & \frac{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Discussing a proactive approach with local Council and confirming they understand the requirement to programme and und maintenance |  |
| 6 | Root heave | OVergrown tree roots －－anagigng pevement －Cneven surace －Create trip hazarad for SUP users | Maintainers Path Users | $\begin{gathered} \text { Design } \\ \text { Maintenance } \end{gathered}$ | Environmental |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current tevel by specifying： <br> Build up the pavement edge with additional soil Choose versatile pavement material for root growth Retaining existing finish levels（no cut） <br> －Bridging over the roots for SUP pavement | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{e}{c} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a site based engineering service from the arborist during construction to trim the rota where feasible |  |
| 7 | Trees falling on live lanes | Damage to trees during construction resulting in trees falling －cause damage to the neighbouring property or moving／parked vehicle －cause delay to construction programme | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Constructors } \\ & \text { Operators } \\ & \text { Workers } \\ & \text { Neighbours } \end{aligned}$ | Construction | Environmental |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Specifying presence of arborist at all times during ction around trees <br> Specifying hand excavations around trees | ¢ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䟵 } \\ & \frac{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a site based engineering service during construction； <br> Highlighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen |  |
| 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treee leaves accumlation } \\ & \text { at catchpis } \end{aligned}$ | Tree seeds／leaves can block outfalls and catchpits and prevent efficient drainage causing water pooling；users to walk around puddles and run into the oncoming cyclist／pedestrian | Maintainers Path Users Workers | $\begin{gathered} \text { Design } \\ \text { Maintenance } \end{gathered}$ | Stormwater |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 嘓 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | The risk has been controlled to the current level by specifinis： －reguar rubbish collection at catchpits －regular drainage inspection | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} c \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 的喈 |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Discussing a proactive approach with local Council and confirming they understand the requirement to programme and fund maintenance |  |
| 9 | Upititing of street lighting near tree roots | Community using the footpath at risk of injury from unstable light poles． | Path Users Maintainers | $\begin{gathered} \text { Design } \\ \text { Maintenance } \end{gathered}$ | Electrical |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Keep streetlghts away from dripline to minimise risk of uplifting in design | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { b } \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 嵐裔 |  |  | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Discussing a proactive approach with local Council and confirming they understand the requirement to programme and fund maintenance |  |
| 10 | Heavy storm action | Heavy storm action might lead to to high water table and removal of ground subject，causing path instability or undermining | Path Users Maintainers | $\begin{gathered} \text { Design } \\ \text { Maintenance } \end{gathered}$ | Stormwater |  | 誊 $\vdots$ $\vdots$ | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Additional planting to provide nature based solutions to improve foreshore stability |  |  |  |  | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Discussing a proactive approach with local Council and confirming they understand the requirement to programme and fund maintenance |  |
| 11 | Tree roots growth | Growth of tree roots can intude and damage the exisiting utilities nearby | Maintainers | Design | Utilities |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 戔 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －identification of existing utilites and maintaining standard clearance through BeforeUDig plans． －specifying detailed uily assessmen tand dentification is carried out in subsequent design stages and prior to utility operators（NUOs）in the DPS |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\stackrel{y}{2}$ $\vdots$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 唇 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －desktop assessment of utilities and ensuring no further － －further utility assessment to be carried out in subsequent design stage |  |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Raising level of } \\ & \text { pavement } \end{aligned}$ | Raising level of pavement creates hard edge from pavement onto grass and can cause trip hazards over the path edge． | Path Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Build up the pavement edge with additional soil and gradual slope which elimates the <br> －provision of fence where the embankment is steep in approach to Nihinui Point | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{b}{k} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  | $\frac{\text { 或 }}{2}$ |  | － | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Build up the pavement edge with additional soil and gradual slope which elimates the trip hazard and does not create a steep embankment． <br> －provision of fence where the embankment is steep in approach to Nihinui Point |  |
| 13 | Pinch point at the crossing point | The narrowing pinch point section，created by buildout of the SUP at the zebra crossing and directed the SUP in front of the two trees can result in conflicts between users and crashes． | Path Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  | l | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Clear lane assignment through arrow markings around the trees where path splits off <br> -2.5 m wide is the minimum width SUP can be designed for without a departure and considered an acceptable width for a mobility user and pedestrian to cross by | － |  |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －consider removing $2 x$ parking spaces to reduce pinch point in design stage <br> parking |  |


| IDENTIFY SAFE desice risk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SH11 P2W Safety in Design Workshop ASSESSMENT SAFE DESICN RISK－CURRENT EXPOSURE |  |  |  |  |  | IMPLEMENT SAFE DESICN RISK TREATMENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Risk Title | Event／Cause／Consequence | Persons Aficted | Applicable | Applicable Disciplines | Applicable WBSs |  | （Risk Treatment） Current Control Measures |  |  |  |  |  | （Risk TTeatiment） Action Summary | Comments |
| 14 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { Troess besides the } \\ \text { crosing point } \end{array}$ | The crossing point of SUP at the zebra crossing is in front of the two trees， resulting in poor visbility for path user crossing to observe the road situation and on－road user to observe the crossing user． | Path Users On－road Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  | 戔 | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －specifying regular maintenance of tree branches to ensure visibility is achieved <br> －maintaining existing footpath arrangement behind the tree and provision of SUP providing additional facility for the users | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{b}{k} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －consider removing $2 x$ parking spaces to reduce pinch point in ubsequent design stage parking |  |
| 15 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Work near live traficic } \\ & \text { lanes } \end{aligned}\right.$ | Construction works to occur besides live carriageway －result in injury of personnel on site | Path Users Constructors | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{.}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{\omega}} \end{aligned}$ | The risk has been controlled to the current level by ensuring TTM and construction methodology is robust Stop－go TTM for work near live lane during construction stage <br> －temporary removal of parking during construction to create safe working zone | $\begin{aligned} & \text { b⿳亠口冖口⺝刂} \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ |  | 㜢 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{y}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a robust site based engineering service aring construction <br> Robust Traffic Mz in the construction methododogy statemen anagement Plan |  |
| 16 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Dawn blessing during } \\ \text { construction } \end{array}$ | People gathering near live lanes and construction site at dawn blessing | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Path Users } \\ \text { Consturors } \\ \text { Local Comentien } \\ \text { Cand Witites } \end{array}$ | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 戔 } \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | The risk has been controlled to the current tevel by： －nisite personnel to manage cyclists and pedestrians | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 稁 } \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{0}{0} \\ \text { 䯧 } \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 㜢 |  | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by during construction； <br> －lighlighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen Robust Trafic Management Plan |  |
| 17 | Un－clear crossing access <br> attern ours sitini <br> construction site | Un－clear crossing access after hours within construction site can result in path users enter the working zone without awaring，leading to injury or death | Path Users | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controled to the current level by ensuring appropriate construction methodology review taging of lighting to ensure footpath access retained Enclose the construction working area Robust TTM ensuring alternative path is maintained at all times during construction | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \stackrel{y}{\vdots} \\ & \dot{c} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 产 亳 要 |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Offering to provide a robust site based engineering service during construction， Highlighting －Highlighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen －Robust Traffic Management Plan |  |
| 18 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Footpath losure during } \\ \text { construction } \end{array}$ | Footpath closure during construction can result in pedestrians walking on live traffic lane，which leads to car crash and injury． | Path Users | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  |  |  |  | 枈 | 浐 | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by －Offering to provide a robust site based engineering service Curing construction： <br> －Highighting the risk in the construction methodology statemen －Robust Traftic Management Plan <br> －Robstranc Managementan |  |
| 19 | Pullants run off from construction | Pullants or dirts run off from construction might go into beach and cause contamination． | Local Communities and 1 WI | Construction | $\underset{\substack{\text { Roads \＆} \\ \text { Highways }}}{ }$ |  | 戔 | The risk has been controlled to the current level by －Construction methodology：regular environment check \＆assessment and put measurement in place |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{0}{0} \\ \text { 膏 } \\ \vdots \\ \end{array}$ |  |  | － | The risk will be actioned to an acceppable level by： during construction； <br> Highighting the risk in the construction methododogy statemen Robust Traffic Management Plan gement Plan |  |
| 20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pedestrian crossing on } \\ & \text { road during construction } \end{aligned}$ | Local users crossing to the service station／carparks on western side in Davis Cres on road during construction can lead to crash incident． | Path Users | Construction | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －Retain 1 pedestrian crossing during construction | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{e}{c} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  | 㜢 | （ |  | The risk will be actioned to an acceptable level by： －Offering to provide a robust site based engineering service －Highionhtintuction <br> Highighting the risk in the construction methododogy statemen Robust $T$ ． Robust Trafic Management Plan |  |
| 21 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Proposesed } 2.5 \mathrm{~m} \text { SUP on } \\ \text { shara angles } \end{array}$ | Proposed 2.5 m SUP at the zebra crossing occurs on sharp angle due to restricted available space which can create conflicts between the 2 directions of SUP and footpath users，with cyclists riding at speed． | Path Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The isk has been controlled to the current level by： －provining appropiate signage and visuals through ine markin －speifing urban andscape in the proposed buildout to nencourage slower speed envirionment | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{.}{\omega} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by －providing appropriate signage and visuals through line marking <br> －different surfacing for SUP to create visual difference to encourage lower speed environment consideration －specifying considering urban landscape in the proposed buildout to encourage lower speed environment |  |
| 22 | Prooosed Two－way SUP | The proposed TWo－way SUP can create conficict between the 2 directions of sup and footpath users． SUP and fotpath users． | Path Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by －ensuring minimum 3.0 m wide SUP width maintained consistently <br> directional arrows and difference surface finishing around the zebra crossing to create visual difference and encourage slower speed environment where the pinch point occurs at the zebra crossing －provide signages | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \frac{b}{k} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －ensuring minimum 3.0 m wide SUP width maintained consistently <br> －directional arrows and difference surface finishing around the zebra crossing to create visual difference and encourage zebra crossing zebra crossing |  |
| 23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No raised table on } \\ & \text { crossing } \end{aligned}$ | The absence of raised table can lower the awareness of vehicle driver to the present path users when they passing through the crossing point．They can hit the path users who＇s crossing | Path Users | Design | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by －specifying urban landscape in the buildout for visual speed reduction environment to be considered in next design stage －Removed car parks adjacent to the crossing to increase visibility －maintaining existing red colour |  |  | 枈 |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －urban landscape in the buildout for visual speed reduction environment <br> －Removed car parks adjacent to the crossing to increase visibility <br> －maintaining existing red colour surfacing at the crossing and providing sufficient lighting |  |
| 24 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { No bike parking near the } \\ \text { dairy } \end{array}$ | Without bike parking facilities near the dairy，the parkee bike might be easily stolen． | Path Users | Operations | Roads \＆ Highways |  |  | The risk has been controlled to the current level by： －consider bike parking faclities in subsequent design stage | － |  | － | $\\| \text { 要要高 }$ | － | The risk has been controled to the current level by： －consider bike parking facilities in subsequent design stage |  |
| 25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vehicle separators } \\ & \text { creating trip hazard } \end{aligned}$ | the proposed vehicle stoppers at the chevron marking along parallel parking may cause tripping hazard for vehicle passenger resulting in trips and falls and conflicts with the SUP users | Path Users | Operations | Roads \＆ Highways |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \frac{0}{2} \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline i \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Consider removing the proposed separators and trial just with chevron marking based on driver awareness to park bay in subsequent design stage | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \frac{b}{k} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | － |  |  |
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[^0]:    ** Values taken from Waka Kotahi Stormwater Treatment Standard for State Highway Infrastructure Table 6-2

[^1]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{https}: / /$ www.fndc.govt.nz/Visiting-the-Far-North/Responsible-camping?BestBetMatch=freedom\%20camping|28911163-c80a-4343-938d-d968e3ae9015|fc9462bd-8413-4be1-a1a5-6a79217d0b98|en-AU

