ATTACHMENT 1

CONCEPT INTERSECTION DESIGNS





LEGEND	
	NEW ROADMARKING
	EXISTING ROADMARKING
	NEW EDGE OF SEAL
	ISLAND

	and the second se	the second se	And in case of the local division of the loc				
n	A Zhong Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:1000 (A3)						
oved	T Langwell	17101 - G - (7)	Date	27.08.19			
ning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It pied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd							



By By

Date

This drawing is the property of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It therefore cannot be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd.



rescott Road
Project Title Designed P Kelly Dra

LEGEND		
	NEW ROADMARKING	
	EXISTING ROADMARKING	
	NEW EDGE OF SEAL	
	ISLAND	



anning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It pried, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd









TPC TRAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD	Project Title Ruakaka Service Centre	Designed AS Di Checked AS A
Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604 Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficplanning.co.nz	Sheet Title Access Option 1	This drawing is the property of Traffic therefore cannot be traced, scanned,

00 Titirangi Rd,	Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604
817-2500	www.trafficplanning.co.nz

Date

By

LEGEND	
	NEW ROADMARKING
	NEW EDGE OF SEAL
	NEW ISLAND



This drawing is the property of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It therefore cannot be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd



LEGEND NEW ROADMARKING NEW EDGE OF SEAL NEW ISLAND	
Compound curves to suit truck tracking	
n Pl Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:500	(A3)
oved TL 17101 - G2-2 - (2) Date 04.05	5.21

This drawing is the property of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It therefore cannot be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd



LEGEND		
<u> </u>	NEW ROADMARKING	
	NEW EDGE OF SEAL	
	NEW ISLAND	

-

-

-

'n	PI Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:500 (A3)					
oved	ved TL 17101 - G2-2 - (3) Date 04.05.21					
nning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It pied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd						





LEGEND NEW ROADMARKING NEW EDGE OF SEAL NEW ISLAND NEW ISLAND new median island Compound curves to suit truck tracking New island B 55m B 55m				
NEW EDGE OF SEAL NEW ISLAND Orgonomolecurves to suit truck tracking Orgonomolecurves to state state tracking Orgonomolecurves to state at a confidential document. I				_
NEW ISLAND NEW ISLAND Ompound curves to Suit truck tracking Object No - (Sheet No) 55m				
NEW ISLAND new median island Compound curves to suit truck tracking Ba Ba <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>				
Compound curves to suit truck tracking mew median island Compound curves to suit truck tracking Image: Compound curves to suit truck tracking			NEW ISLAND	
n PI Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:500 (A3) ved TL 17101 - G2-4 - (1) Date 04.05.21 nning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It		Cosu	new median isla mpound curves to truck tracking 55m	nc
PI Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:500 (A3) oved TL 17101 - G2-4 - (1) Date 04.05.21 nning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It				
TL 17101 - G2-4 - (1) Date 04.05.21 nning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It It	n	ום	Project No. (Sheet No.) 01 4	
nning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It	ı oved	ы ТІ	Project No - (Sneet No) Scales 1:500 (A3 17101 - G2-4 - (1) Date 04.05.24	3)
ind reproduced used or exhibited by	ning	Consulta	s Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It	

			Tie into existing medi
			A33
		Project Title	Designed AS Draw
	TRAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS LT		Checked AS App
	, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604	Sheet Title Access Option 3	This drawing is the property of Traffic Pla therefore cannot be traced, scanned, ca
Rev Revisions By Date	www.uamopianiny.co.nz	J	JU

				consented diverge taper ebd
			Projet Tile	
	Level 1, 400 T	itirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604	Ruakaka Service Centre Sheet Title Access Option 3	Checked AS Appr This drawing is the property of Traffic Pla therefore cannot be traced, scanned co
Rev Revisions	By Date Phone: 09 817	-2000 www.uanicpianning.co.nz) (

\square			
Rev	Revisions	Ву	Date

	TRAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD

Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604 Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficplanning.co.nz

)	Project Title		
		Ruakaka	Se

ervice Centre	

Designed	AS	Drawn
Checked	AS	Approve
This drawin therefore ca	g is the property annot be traced.	/ of Traffic Planni scanned. copie

Sheet Title Access Option 3

ΡI Project No - (Sheet No) Scales 1:500.0001 (A3) 17101 - G_2 - 7- (1) ved TL Date 04.05.21 ning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It ied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd

		_		

Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604 Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficplanning.co.nz

Checked AS

Sheet Title Access Option 3

This drawing is the property of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd. It is an instrument of service, and as such is a confidential document. It therefore cannot be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, used or exhibited by any third party without the express permission in writing of Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd

GENERAL LANDSCAPING

3.511

NA

\sim		-	
Rev	Revisions	Ву	Date

TPC	RAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD
Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box	60-255, Auckland 0604
Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficp	blanning.co.nz

Project Title Ruakaka Service Centre

Sheet Title Access Option 3 Vehicle Tracking- Van

511

Designed AS Checked AS

211

GENERAL LANDSCAPING

3.511

N

				TPC TRAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD	Project Title Ruakaka Service Centre	Designed AS Dra Checked AS Ap
R	ev Revisions	Ву	Date	Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604 Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficplanning.co.nz	Sheet Title Access Option 3 Vehicle Tracking - Semi-Trailer	This drawing is the property of Traffic Plannir be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, use

1.51

211

1 10		
(Nia.		
5		× \
		*
		NO
		N'a.
		/ 5// \
_		
		-An
		"MD
	7.288	
	Image: Way 20° Horiz 1.33 3.7 4 9.2 1.3 1.3	
	Image: Way 20° Horiz Image: Way 20° Horiz 1.33 3.7 4 9.2 1.3 1.3	
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer)	
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Verall Vidth	m
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Overall Body Height Width Overall Body Height Min Body Ground Clearance	m
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Overall Body Height Min Body Ground Clearance Track Width Track Width	n
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Overall Body Height Track Width Track Width Lock-to-lock time Wall to Wall Turning Radius Wall to Wall Turning Radius	m
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length 19.380n Overall Body Height 4.386m Min Body Ground Clearance 0.311m Track Width 2.550m Lock-to-lock time 6.00s Wall to Wall Turning Radius 12.500m	m
	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Overall Body Height Track Vidth Track Width Lock-to-lock time Wall to Wall Turning Radius	m
Drawn PI	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Verall Width Track Vidth Track Width Lock-to-lock time Wall to Wall Turning Radius Project No - (Sheet No) Scales	m 1:300 (A3)
Drawn PI	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Overall Body Height Track Width Track Width Lock-to-lock time Project No - (Sheet No) Project No - (Sheet No) Scales	m 1:300 (A3)
Drawn PI upproved TL	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Rear steer) Overall Length Verial Width Track Width Track Width Lock-to-lock time Project No - (Sheet No) Project No - (Sheet No) 17101 - G_2 - 7- (4) Date	m 1:300 (A3) 04.05.21

ATTACHMENT 2

ON-SITE VEHICLE TRACKING DIAGRAMS

	\sim		
12			
\leq			
		\sim	
		_	
	//////////////////////////////////////)	
) /	\frown
5) <	$\langle \rangle \land $
			\sim
			\langle / \rangle
			\sim
Sn		Y	
n tu		\cup	
Ovin	ning .	\mathcal{A}	
J'Ide	b. Circle		
IVAR	Nuffer (S	
~ 6	rroe to	1	
			/
			\sim
\wedge			
			Aller IV
			Wp./ /s
\checkmark			
		Uh.	\sim
		N.	
	7.288 16.633		
\searrow	\square		
]			
		$\overline{00}$	
	Max 20° Horiz 5.33 Max 0° Vert		
FF	9.2	1.3 1.3	1.3 0.95
Ìm	AT - Truck - HPMV - 19.45m Semi-Trailer (Re	ear steer)	
лп	Overall Length Overall Width	19.380 2.550r)m n
	Overall Body Height Min Body Ground Clearance	4.386r 0.311r	n n
	I rack Width Lock-to-lock time	2.550r 6.00s	n 📗
\times	Wall to Wall Turning Radius	12.500	Jm
~ ` L			
n AZ	Project No - (Sheet No)	Scales	1:500 (A3)
oved TI	17101 - L - (8)	Date	24 09 20
	I It is an instrument of service and service is a set of the	ial dag	
or exhibited by a	any third party without the express permission in writing of t 2020 Traffic Planning Consultants I td	Traffic Planr	ning Consultants Ltd.

/////			
		//	
	2 📉 🔪	//,	
m '			2
		=	
	\sim		
		/ /	-
\mathbf{X}			
			<u>,</u>
			\rightarrow
	Y/ /		
		~ //	
		\times	
		X	
		X	
		×	
		×	
	52 52 52 55 55 55 55 55 55 55		
	52 52 53 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	5.2	200m
	52 52 52 53 55 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	5.	200m 400m
	52 52 52 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	5: 1: 4:	200m 200m 200m 200m 212m 340m 2050m
	52 52 52 53 B99 Vehicle (Realistic min radius) (2004) Overall Length Overall Width Overall Width Overall Width Overall Width Coverall Body Height Min Body Ground Clearance Track Width Lock-to-lock time Curb to Curb Turning Radius	5.2 1.5 2.2 0.1 4.0 6.2	200m 240m 200m 212m 312m 340m 200s 250m
	52 52 52 53 52 53 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	5.3 1.9 0.3 4.0 6.2	200m 200m 200m 200m 212m 212m 212m 212m
AZ	52 52 52 53 52 53 52 53 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	5.2 1.5 2.2 1.4 6.2 Scales	200m 200m 200m 312m 340m 2050m 250m 1:250 (A3)
AZ red TL	52 52 53 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 56 57 57 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 53 54 55 55 56 57 57 58 59 59 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	5.2 1.5 2.5 0.3 1.6 6.2 Scales Date	200m 200m 200m 312m 312m 300s 550m 1:250 (A3) 24.09.20

ACOUSTIC	
MITIGATION	
	D D
	R R
Image: Construction of the second	pment Designed AZ Dra Centre Checked TL AD
Level 1, 400 Titirangi Rd, Titirangi, P.O Box 60-255, Auckland 0604 Phone: 09 817-2500 www.trafficplanning.co.nz	- B99 This drawing is the property of Traffic Plannin be traced, scanned, copied, reproduced, used

ATTACHMENT 3

INDEPENDENT ROAD SAFETY AUDIT REPORT WITH DESIGNER RESPONSES

PRELIMINARY DESIGN ROAD SAFETY AUDIT RUAKĀKĀ SERVICE CENTRE

REAL RADIA AND DEDUCTION OF THE REAL PROPERTY OF

PREPARED FOR TRAFFIC PLANNING CONSULTANTS

18 March 2021

- (* T**

This document has been prepared for the benefit of Traffic Planning Consultants. No liability is accepted by this company or any employee or sub-consultant of this company with respect to its use by any other person.

This disclaimer shall apply notwithstanding that the report may be made available to Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and other persons for an application for permission or approval to fulfil a legal requirement.

QUALITY STATEMENT

PROJECT MANAGER	ROAD SAFETY AUDIT TEAM LEADER
Mark Moslin-Thomas	Keith Weale
PREPARED BY	1/1/11/11/0
Keith Weale	18 March 2012
CHECKED BY	
Niele Churge	Alan.
	18 March 2012
REVIEWED BY	
Nick Gluyas	18 March 2012
APPROVED FOR ISSUE BY	Hat
Mark Moslin-Thomas	24 March 2021

AUCKLAND

Level 3 Stantec House, 111 Carlton Gore Road, Newmarket, Auckland 1023 PO Box 13-052, Armagh, Christchurch 8141 TEL +64 9 580 4500

Stantec | Ruakākā Service Centre | 18 March 2021

Status: Final | Project No.: 310204673 Child No.: 100.100 | Our ref: rpt_ruakaka_serv_ctr_RSA_final - draft designer responses.docx

Status: Final | Project No.: 310204673 Child No.: 100.100 | Our ref: rpt_ruakaka_serv_ctr_RSA_final - draft designer responses.docx | Page i

Stantec | Ruakākā Service Centre | 18 March 2021

Traffic Planning Consultants

Ruakākā Service Centre

CONTENTS

1	Introduction1
1.1	Safety Audit Definition and Purpose1
1.2	The Project2
1.3	The Road Safety Audit Team2
1.4	Previous Road Safety Audits
1.5	Scope of this Road Safety Audit
1.6	Briefing and Exit Meeting
1.7	Safety Audit and Site Visit
1.8	Report Format
1.9	Documents Provided
1.10	Disclaimer4
2	Safety Concerns
2.1	SH1 Access
2.2	Service Centre Internal Layout
2.3	SH15 Access9
2.4	Property Access
2.5	Pedestrians14
2.6	Lighting15
3	Audit Statement
4	Response and Decision Statements
4.1	Designer's Responses
4.2	Safety Engineer's Comments (if applicable)17
4.3	Project Manager's Decisions
4.4	Designer's Statement
4.5	Safety Audit Close Out
5	References19

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Concern Assessment Rating Matrix	3
Table 1-2: Concern Categories	4

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Site location	.2
Figure 2: Proposed high-speed left -turn deceleration lane	.6
Figure 3: Proposed raised table intersection at service centre threshold	.6
Figure 4: Pedestrian crossings in car park	.7
Figure 5: Typical retrofitted speed hump on entrance (Google, 2009)	.8
Figure 6: Typical retrofitted speed hump on internal road layout in service centre (Google, 2009)	.8
Figure 7: Proposed seagull intersection	.9
Figure 8: Downstream weave from seagull intersection to roundabout	11
Figure 9: Property accesses off SH15	13
Figure 10: Missing connection G.A.S. forecourt and footpath to Ruakākā service centre (Google, 2009)	14

1 Introduction

1.1 Safety Audit Definition and Purpose

A road safety audit is a term used internationally to describe an independent review of a future road project to identify any safety concerns that may affect the safety performance. The audit team considers the safety of all road users and qualitatively reports on road safety issues or opportunities for safety improvement.

A road safety audit is therefore a formal examination of a road project, or any type of project which affects road users (including cyclists, pedestrians, mobility impaired etc.), carried out by an independent competent team who identify and document road safety concerns.

A road safety audit is intended to help deliver a safe road system and is not a review of compliance with standards.

The primary objective of a road safety audit is to deliver a project that achieves an outcome consistent with Safer Journeys and the Safe System approach, which is a safe road system free of death and serious injury. The road safety audit is a safety review used to identify all areas of a project that are inconsistent with a Safe System and bring those concerns to the attention of the client so that the client can make a value judgement as to appropriate action(s) based on the risk guidance provided by the safety audit team.

The key objective of a road safety audit is summarised as:

'to deliver completed projects that contribute towards a safe road system that is free of death and serious injury by identifying and ranking potential safety concerns for all road users and others affected by a road project.'

A road safety audit should desirably be undertaken at project milestones such as:

- concept stage (part of business case);
- scheme or preliminary design stage (part of pre-implementation);
- detail design stage (pre-implementation or implementation); or
- pre-opening or post-construction stage (implementation or post-implementation).

A road safety audit is not intended to be a technical or financial audit and does not substitute for a design check of standards or guidelines. Any recommended treatment of an identified safety concern is intended to be indicative only, and to focus the designer on the type of improvements that might be appropriate. It is not intended to be prescriptive and other ways of improving the road safety or operational problems identified should also be considered.

In accordance with the procedures set down in the NZTA Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects Guidelines - Interim release May 2013 the audit report should be submitted to the client who will instruct the designer to respond. The designer should consider the report and comment to the client on each of any concerns identified, including their cost implications where appropriate, and make a recommendation to either accept or reject the audit report recommendation.

For each audit team recommendation that is accepted, the client will make the final decision and brief the designer to make the necessary changes and/or additions. As a result of this instruction the designer shall action the approved amendments. The client may involve a safety engineer to provide commentary to aid with the decision.

Decision tracking is an important part of the road safety audit process. A decision tracking table is embedded into the report format at the end of each set of recommendations. It is to be completed by the designer, safety engineer, and client for each issue, and should record the designer's response, client's decision (and asset manager's comments in the case where the client and asset manager are not one and the same) and action taken.

A copy of the report including the designer's response to the client and the client's decision on each recommendation shall be given to the road safety audit team leader as part of the important feedback loop. The road safety audit team leader will disseminate this to team members.

1.2 The Project

The project comprises a proposed service centre for fuel, restrooms, fast food, freedom camping, picnicking etc. located in the northern quadrant of the existing roundabout intersection of SH1 and SH15¹ (Port Marsden Highway) at Ruakākā about 25 km south of Whangārei.

The design and traffic impact assessment has been undertaken by Traffic Planning Consultants on behalf of the developer.

Two accesses are proposed—a southbound left-turn slip lane from SH1 at Prescott Road, and a raised median seagull intersection allowing all turning movements on SH15, 225 m east of the roundabout. The service centre trip generation is estimated to be about 3400 vehicles per day.

The entrance to the southbound deceleration lane has been positioned just north of Prescott Road to avoid drivers turning right out of Prescott Road and then left into the service centre (a weave) across fast-moving southbound traffic approaching the roundabout.

Figure 1: Site location

A second painted seagull intersection with a 220 m eastbound deceleration lane has previously been proposed about 720 m from the roundabout as part of a separate consented service centre development dating back to 2011. This is assumed to be for information only as it is not part of this project.

1.3 The Road Safety Audit Team

This road safety audit has been carried out in accordance with the NZTA Road Safety Audit Procedure for Projects Guidelines – Interim release May 2013, by:

- Keith Weale, Stantec, Auckland, and
- Mike Sullivan, Engineering Equilibrium, Whangarei.

1.4 Previous Road Safety Audits

The road safety audit team is not aware of any previous road safety audits that have been undertaken for this project.

¹ The supplied drawings and report indicate SH15A throughout, which is incorrect. This road safety audit report therefore refers to the Port Marsden Highway as SH15.

1.5 Scope of this Road Safety Audit

This is a preliminary design road safety audit of the project described in Section 1.2. Although the internal circulation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic has been considered in general, the focus of this road safety audit has been on the safety of the proposed accesses to SH1 and SH15.

The proposed painted seagull intersection including a deceleration lane as part of a 2011 consented development further to the east of this project is not included in this road safety audit. However, any changes to the proposed Ruakākā Service Centre seagull should take into consideration any potential safety issues on the consented design and vice versa.

1.6 Briefing and Exit Meeting

No formal briefing or exit meeting was held with the designers. The road safety audit team relied on the supplied drawings and traffic impact assessment report listed in Section 1.9.

1.7 Safety Audit and Site Visit

The road safety auditors visited the site of this audit on Wednesday 9 December 2020.

The road safety audit team carried out a desk top safety audit via a Teams meeting during COVID-19 Level 3 lockdown on Monday 1 March 2021. The safety auditors also examined the revisions to the drawings supplied on 8 March individually. The amendments related to the removal of the eastbound deceleration lane from the proposed seagull intersection.

1.8 Report Format

The potential road safety problems identified have been ranked as follows.

The expected crash frequency is qualitatively assessed on the basis of expected exposure (how many road users will be exposed to a safety issue) and the likelihood of a crash resulting from the presence of the issue. The severity of a crash outcome is qualitatively assessed on the basis of factors such as expected speeds, type of collision, and type of vehicle involved.

Reference to historic crash rates or other research for similar elements of projects, or projects as a whole, have been drawn on where appropriate to assist in understanding the likely crash types, frequency and likely severity that may result from a particular concern.

The frequency and severity ratings are used together to develop a combined qualitative risk ranking for each safety issue using the concern assessment rating matrix in Table 1-1. The qualitative assessment requires professional judgement and a wide range of experience in projects of all sizes and locations.

Severity (likelihood of death or serious injury)	Frequency (probability of a crash)			
	Frequent	Common	Occasional	Infrequent
Very likely	Serious	Serious	Significant	Moderate
Likely	Serious	Significant	Moderate	Moderate
Unlikely	Significant			
Very unlikely				

Table 1-1: Concern Assessment Rating Matrix

While all safety concerns should be considered for action, the client or nominated project manager will make the decision as to what course of action will be adopted based on the guidance given in this ranking process with consideration to factors other than safety alone. As a guide a suggested action for each concern category is given in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2: Concern Categories

Concern	Suggested action
Serious	Major safety concern that must be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.
Significant	Significant safety concern that should be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.
Moderate	Moderate safety concern that should be addressed to improve safety.
Minor	Minor safety concern that should be addressed where practical to improve safety.

In addition to the ranked safety issues, it is appropriate for the safety audit team to provide additional comments with respect to items that may have a safety implication but lie outside the scope of the safety audit. A comment may include items where the safety implications are not yet clear due to insufficient detail for the stage of project, items outside the scope of the audit such as existing issues not impacted by the project or an opportunity for improved safety but not necessarily linked to the project itself. While typically comments do not require a specific recommendation, in some instances suggestions may be given by the auditors.

1.9 Documents Provided

Traffic Planning Consultants provided the road safety audit team with the following documents on 8 March 2021 specifically for this audit.

17101 – G – (7)	Overall Plan SH1	4 February 2021
17101 – G – (8)	Overall Plan SH1	4 February 2021
17101 – G – (9)	Dimension Plan SH1	4 February 2021
17101 – G – (10)	Dimension Plan SH1	4 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (12)	Overall Plan \$H15	5 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (13)	Overall Plan \$H15	3 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (14)	Overall Plan \$H15	3 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (15)	Overall Plan \$H15	3 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (16)	Overall Plan \$H15	5 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (17)	Vehicle Tracking SH15	3 February 2021
17101 – G2 – (18)	Vehicle Tracking SH15	3 February 2021
Ruakākā Service Centre 2581 S	State Highway 1 Traffic Impact Assessment	February 2021

In addition, the following drawings were supplied on 30 November 2021. These internal service centre plans are deemed to be for information only.

17101 – L – (1)	Overall Plan Service Centre	24 September 2020
17101 – L – (2 - 21)	Vehicle tracking Service Centre	24 September 2020

1.10 Disclaimer

The findings and recommendations in this report are based on an examination of available relevant plans, the specified road and its environs, and the opinions of the road safety audit team. However, it must be recognised that eliminating safety concerns cannot be guaranteed since no road can be regarded as absolutely safe and no warranty is implied that all safety issues have been identified in this report. Safety audits do not constitute a design review nor are they an assessment of standards with respect to engineering or planning documents.

Readers are urged to seek specific technical advice on matters raised and not rely solely on the report.

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the report, it is made available on the basis that anyone relying on it does so at their own risk without any liability to the safety audit team or their organisations.

2 Safety Concerns

2.1 SH1 Access

2.1.1 Southbound left-turn deceleration slip lane

A southbound left-turn deceleration lane from SH1 at Prescott Road is proposed as shown in Figure 2.

Comment

Figure 2: Proposed high-speed left -turn deceleration lane

The high-speed southbound left-turn deceleration slip lane would have been a safety concern were it not for the proposed raised table speed calming measure at the threshold of the internal road layout and forecourt arrowed in Figure 3. This is an essential safety measure and must not be omitted.² Furthermore, the slope and height of the raised table must be enough to limit speeds to about 30 km/h regardless of tour bus and heavy vehicle comfort requirements.

Figure 3: Proposed raised table intersection at service centre threshold

 $^{^2}$ The road safety audit team assumes that the arrowed section in Figure 3 is indeed a raised table. If it is not, then it should be.

Designer response	The arrowed section in Figure 3 is indeed a proposed raised table and will not be omitted.
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment
Client decision	Insert comment
Action taken	Insert comment

2.2 Service Centre Internal Layout

2.2.1 Pedestrian zebra crossings and speed control

Moderate

A layout of islands and walkways within the greater car parking area is proposed as shown in Figure 4, however only one appears to be shown as a raised table crossing. Since the car park is large, speeds can creep up. The distance from the entrance threshold at the northern end of the service centre to the fuel pumps is 170 m and from the eastern end it is realistically about 140 m after the sharp left turn.

It would be safer to place all zebra crossings on raised tables in case someone e.g. a child runs across a zebra crossing unseen from behind a car. This would also save having to install speed humps as is so often the case in such service centres as shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6.

The access from the east (SH 15) has little speed control other than its two ninety degree curves, but the carriageway width is up to 11 m wide for a two-lane road.

Figure 4: Pedestrian crossings in car park

Figure 5: Typical retrofitted speed hump on entrance (Google, 2009)

Figure 6: Typical retrofitted speed hump on internal road layout in service centre (Google, 2009)

Recommendation(s)

- 1. Place all zebra crossings on raised tables to protect the zebra crossing and to reduce speed in the service centre generally.
- 2. Add entrance threshold speed control to the eastern entrance possibly near the fuel kiosk.

Frequency Crashes are likely infrequent	lo be	Severity Death or serious injury likely	is	Rating The safety concern is moderate	
Designer response	Agree with Roa physical speed fuel kiosk. These	d Safety Auditors - all ze control should be adde e can be required as co	bra crossing d to the eas nsent condi	s should be on raised tables a tern entrance possibly near th tions.	nd e
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment				

Client decision	Insert comment
Action taken	Insert comment

2.3 SH15 Access

2.3.1 Seagull intersection form

Serious

A raised median seagull layout has been proposed for the access off SH15. The traffic impact assessment report suggests that the position has been chosen due to prescribed spacings (about 200) between the intersection and the roundabout. This has placed the intersection on the inside of a reasonably sharp horizontal curve where the sight distance, particularly to the east, is limited.

Figure 7: Proposed seagull intersection

While the reasoning for spacing requirements between normal T-intersections is reasonable, the same reasoning may not necessarily apply to roundabouts where everyone has to slow down to negotiate the intersection i.e. there is no highspeed through traffic passing through both intersections.

The designers have compensated for the reduced sight distance to the east by proposing a seagull layout so that drivers turning right out of the service centre do not have to give way to through traffic approaching from the east—only a lower volume of traffic turning right into the service centre.

Unfortunately, a Waka Kotahi study a few years ago found that, at best, seagull intersections are only as safe as a normal T-intersection. Poorly designed seagull intersections, those with only painted markings and with short deceleration and acceleration lengths, were significantly less safe.

The main safety issue is that drivers entering the main road from the minor road have difficulty in determining whether they need to give way to the left or not. They do need to give way to slower vehicles turning right, but not to faster vehicles heading straight through. This is counter intuitive. Also, drivers generally cannot see, from their low observation angle, what lane the approaching vehicle is in and whether it is going to turn right. Not everyone signals well in advance. Raised medians do help in this regard, but the right-turn bay needs to be long enough so that straight through drivers cannot suddenly change their minds and decide to turn right. This sudden change of mind is a distinct possibility as they will not be able to see the service centre until they reach the intersection. In this respect the proposed seagull intersection is particularly bad as the start of the right-turn bay is only about 60 m from the entrance, and it is this aspect that has ranked the safety concern with a common frequency coupled with a T-bone crash that has resulted in a serious safety concern.

With all this indecision going on, drivers forget to recheck that there is no one approaching from their right, or they start to cross and then hesitate or stop as they suddenly realise they have to give way to a rightturning vehicle and they get T-boned—one of the worst safety outcomes, especially as the approaching driver from their right is completely taken by surprise and has no time to react to the vehicle pulling out in front and therefore crashes at high speed.

Recommendation(s)

- If a seagull intersection is to be constructed, then ensure that the kerbed right-turn bay is considerably (hundreds of metres) longer than proposed so that there is no chance of sudden last-minute decision to turn right into the service centre, and so that drivers exiting the service centre have a clear view of which vehicle is in which lane. Note the residential property access requirements discussed in Section 2.4.1 and note any the potential effects on the consented seagull intersection to the east.
- 2. Improve the sight distance to the east by shifting the intersection to another position so that drivers exiting the service centre have a clear view of which vehicle is in which lane.
- 3. Preferably, consider a safer alternative left-in and left-out access arrangement as discussed in Section 2.3.3.

Frequency Crashes are likely common	lo be	Severity Death or serious injury is very likely	Rating The safety concern is serious
Designer response	We have preper moving forward distance to the The second is a central median motorists on SH third option is to central median	red three alternatives for considered of the SH15A site egress to provide east, and replacing the seagull lay variation on this, providing a right island to prohibit right turns into the 15A can go around the roundabout o physically prohibit right turns at the island and provide a left turn site e	ation by NZTA – the first is a slight e 200 metres safe intersection sight yout with a standard right turn bay. turn out from the site and a e site from SH15A (westbound at and turn left into the site). The e SH15A access with a solid egress onto SH1.
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment		
Client decision	Insert comment		
Action taken	Insert comment		

2.3.2 Downstream weave

Moderate

The proposed seagull intersection places all traffic exiting the service centre in the right-only lane (presumably this will be marked straight ahead as well) and all traffic from Marsden Point in the left-only lane. The distance between the end of the acceleration lane and the start of the solid lane line at the roundabout bout is only 100 m. This is far too short to be able to find a gap and change lanes, especially for visitors and tourists whom the service centre is intended to serve, and the weave would take place in a right-hand curve.

There are likely to be lane changing crashes.

The traffic impact report discussed the reasoning for the proposed arrangement based on eliminating the need to merge then diverge before the roundabout, but it is doubtful whether the proposed solution improves the identified merge issue. Instead, it swaps a merge issues for a weave issue, which is potentially more confusing and requires more time to execute.

If the seagull intersection is definitely to be constructed, a mitigating measure might be to provide a double right turn to Whangārei considering the future four-lane widening of SH1. This may partially eliminate some of the weave, but the roundabout would have to be redesigned to eliminate any double right turn conflicts at the exits to the roundabout. Safe pedestrian crossing would also have to be considered across two lanes. Refer to Section 2.5.1.

Figure 8: Downstream weave from seagull intersection to roundabout

Recommendation(s)

- 1. Preferably do not construct a seagull intersection arrangement.
- If the seagull intersection does need to be constructed, then consider a double right turn or a double left turn depending on the dominant movements and consider also that the merge from right to left is more difficult to undertake than from left to right.

Frequency Crashes are likely common	ło be	Severity Death or serious injury is unlikely	Rating The safety concern is moderate
Designer response	We have preper moving forward distance to the The second is a central median motorists on SH third option is to turn site egress All options omit	ared three alternatives for consid d of the SH15A site egress to prov east, and replacing the seagull variation on this, providing a righ island to prohibit right turns into 15A can go around the roundab p physically prohibit right turns at onto SH1. the need for a downstream wea	eration by NZTA – the first is a slight ide 200 metres safe intersection sight ayout with a standard right turn bay. In turn out from the site and a the site from SH15A (westbound out and turn left into the site). The the SH15A access and provide a left ave.
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment	t	
Client decision	Insert comment	ŀ	
Action taken	Insert comment	ł	

2.3.3 Alternative left-in and left-out arrangement

Comment

Bearing in mind that traditionally prescribed intersection spacings may not necessarily apply to roundabouts or to left-in and left out arrangements, the designers could consider a left-in and left-out access on both SH1 and SH15 instead of the proposed southbound slip lane on SH1 and seagull intersection on SH15. The roundabout would provide a safe turnaround facility for all returning right-turn movements.

The stated weave reason for the left-turn deceleration lane starting north of Prescott Road would fall away once Prescott Road becomes left-in and left-out when SH1 is widened to four lanes, or even earlier if incorporated into the short-term SH1 safety improvements.

There would need to be good wayfinding signposting within the service area so that drivers chose the correct exit. The internal road and parking layout would also have to be amended to suit.

Designer response	We have prepared three alternatives for consideration by NZTA – the first is a slight moving forward of the SH15A site egress to provide 200 metres safe intersection sight distance to the east, and replacing the seagull layout with a standard right turn bay. The second is a variation on this, providing a right turn out from the site and a central median island to prohibit right turns into the site from SH15A. (Westbound motorists on SH15A can go around the roundabout and turn left into the site). The third option is to physically prohibit right turns at the SH15A access and provide a left turn site egress onto SH1.
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment
Client decision	Insert comment
Action taken	Insert comment

2.3.4 Fifth roundabout leg

Comment

The road safety audit team is not sure if a fifth roundabout to serve as the only access to the service centre was considered. Roundabouts are the safest form of intersection, but due consideration would need to be given to approach signage.

Considering that the widening of SH1 to four lanes at some stage in the future is envisaged, there may be opportunity to incorporate a fifth leg along with the reconstruction of the roundabout to accommodate the future four SH1 lanes.

2.4 Property Access

2.4.1 Incorporation into service centre access

The traffic impact assessment report states that the property access shown in Figure 9 would be closed and incorporated into the service centre access. Presumably, this arrangement would apply only the western property closest to the seagull intersection, which would be blocked by the raised median shown in light blue.

There would be no safety concern with that arrangement, but the road safety audit team is doubtful that such a right-of-way, which would be shared with a public access, could actually be achieved: or it is just wishful thinking?

If the proposed access cannot be made to work in law, then the designers will have to rethink the seagull intersection as the residents would not be able to turn around the end of the raised medians safely.

If the seagull intersection is constructed and the median island is extended as recommended in Section 2.3.1, then the same left-in and left-out issue would apply to the residential property to the east, which is assumed is not intended to be accesses via the service centre.

Figure 9: Property accesses off SH15

Client decision	Insert comment
Action taken	Insert comment

2.5 Pedestrians

2.5.1 Pedestrians crossing between service centres

Moderate

It is likely that there will be some demand for pedestrians to cross between the G.A.S. service centre and the retailers at the proposed Ruakākā service centre, for example for lunch.

The existing roundabout has wide paved median islands for refuge and footpaths all around the perimeter. There are dropped kerb crossings across SH1 and SH15, but they are narrow, almost invisible, and too far from the roundabout. It is possible that the original designers placed the dropped kerbs to coincide with lighting columns for good reason, but approach speeds will be higher than at the roundabout and the existing positions will probably not coincide with the new pedestrian crossing desire lines between the two service centres.

Figure 8 shows a two-lane approach to the roundabout on SH15. This is likely to be on the desire line for pedestrians, who would probably cross two lanes of traffic in preference to following the longer route around the western side of the roundabout.

Figure 10: Missing connection G.A.S. forecourt and footpath to Ruakākā service centre (Google, 2009)

Recommendation(s)

- 1. When connecting the proposed Ruakākā service centre footpaths to the existing footpaths, ensure that they follow pedestrian desire lines and that they direct pedestrians to the safest points to cross the roundabout, generally about two vehicle lengths back from the perimeter of the roundabout and where the median refuges are wider.
- 2. Provide additional dropped crossings to coincide with the desire lines, as necessary.
- 3. Provide a short path through the flower bed to connect the G.A.S. forecourt with the existing footpath as suggested in Figure 10.
- 4. Ensure that the pedestrian crossing points are adequately lit and supplemented with pedestrian level lighting as required.
- 5. Avoid routing pedestrians to cross two-lane approaches.

Frequency Crashes are likely infrequent	lo be	Severity Death or serious injury is likely	Rating The safety concern is moderate
Designer response	There is no existing demand for pedestrians in this rural area, and no need for footpaths. It is our understanding that the formed strips behind the kerb on the roundabout approaches are off-road cycle lanes, not footpaths. Providing footpaths connecting to the proposed service centre and pedestrian crossing poin as suggested by the Road Safety Auditors may have unintended safety consequences, viz. that such facilities encourage passing motorists who would otherwise drive into the site to park on the State Highway shoulder opposite the service centre instead and use the footpaths and crossing points to cross the highway to the service Centre site boundary between the two site access points, meaning that a person would need to walk 500 metres or more through the site and along the highway to get from the proposed Ruakaka Service Centre to the existing GAS service station. Given the few people that would wish to travel between the two sites, and the potential adverse safety consequences, it would be most appropriate for anyone going from one site to the other to do so in a vehicle rather than walking.		
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment		
Client decision	Insert comment		
Action taken	Insert comment		

2.6 Lighting

2.6.1 Extent of lighting

Comment

The existing roundabout and its approaches are lit, but the existing lighting along SH1 and SH15 would not extend as far as the proposed new accesses.

Ensure that the existing lighting is extended to include Prescott Road and the proposed seagull intersection site.

Ensure that pedestrian paths are adequately lit.

Designer response	All proposed site intersections and traffic islands will be adequately lit as per standard specifications.
Safety Engineer comment	Insert comment
Client decision	Insert comment
Action taken	Insert comment

3 Audit Statement

We declare that we remain independent of the design team and have not been influenced in any way by any party during this road safety audit.

We certify that we have used the available plans, and have examined the specified roads and their environment, to identify features of the project we have been asked to look at that could be changed, removed, or modified in order to improve safety.

We have noted the safety concerns that have been evident in this audit and have made recommendations that may be used to assist in improving safety.

Woald

Date 18 March 2021

Keith Weale, BSc(Eng), BEng(Hons), MSc, CMEngNZ, CPEng Principal Transportation Engineer, Stantec, Auckland

Signed

Signed

11 2010

Date 18 March 2021

Mike Sullivan, BE (Civil), CMEngNZ Director, Engineering Equilibrium, Whangarei

4 Response and Decision Statements

System designers and the people who use the roads must all share responsibility for creating a road system where crash forces do not result in death or serious injury.

4.1 Designer's Responses

I have studied and considered the auditors' safety concerns and recommendations for safety improvements set out in this road safety audit report and I have responded accordingly to each safety concern with the most appropriate and practical solutions and actions, which are to be considered further by the safety engineer (if applicable) and project manager.

Signed anoth Symp

Date 7 May 2021

Anatole Sergejew, Senior Associate, Traffic Planning Consultants Ltd

4.2 Safety Engineer's Comments (if applicable)

I have studied and considered the auditors' safety concerns and recommendations for safety improvements set out in this road safety audit report together with the designer's responses. Where appropriate, I have added comments to be taken into consideration by the project manager when deciding on the action to be taken.

Signed Date

[Safety Engineer's name, qualification, position, company]

4.3 **Project Manager's Decisions**

I have studied and considered the auditors' safety concerns and recommendations for safety improvements set out in this road safety audit report, together with the designer's responses and the comments of the safety engineer (if applicable) and having been guided by the auditor's ranking of concerns have decided the most appropriate and practical action to be taken to address each of the safety concerns.

Signed

Date

[Project Manager's name, qualification, position, company]

4.4 Designer's Statement

I certify that the project manager's decisions and directions for action to be taken to improve safety for each of the safety concerns have been carried out.

Signed

Date

[Designer's name, qualification, position, company]

4.5 Safety Audit Close Out

The project manager is to distribute the audit report incorporating the decisions to the designer, safety audit team leader, safety engineer, and project file.

Date:....

5 References

Google. (2009, December). Street View.

Auckland

Level 3 Stantec House, 111 Carlton Gore Road Newmarket, Auckland 1023 PO Box 13-052, Armagh Christchurch 8141 Tel +64 9 580 4500

Please visit **www.stantec.com** to learn more about how Stantec design with community in mind.

