

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a Board of Inquiry appointed under s149J of the Resource Management Act 1991 to consider Notice of Requirements and applications for Resource Consent made by the New Zealand Transport Agency in relation to the East West Link roading proposal in Auckland.

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF DUNCAN BARRY TINDALL ON BEHALF OF
AUCKLAND COUNCIL
TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT**

Overview of Key Conclusions of Evidence

1. The key conclusions from my evidence are:

- (a) Overall the project will deliver traffic and transport benefits to the community of Onehunga and more widely.
- (b) These benefits are well aligned with the Auckland Plan and consistent with Auckland Council policy and strategy.
- (c) I undertook a review of the evidence base used to design and assess the effects of the Proposal and concluded that it was appropriate and sufficient for the purposes.
- (d) There were several specific aspects of the Proposal where adverse effects could be reduced or avoided through minor amendments to the design, as detailed in the following section.

Summary of Issues Resolved and Unresolved

2. Through the Expert Conferencing process, and subsequently within the information included in the rebuttal evidence of the Applicant's experts, I was able to discuss and resolve many of the issues I raised in my Evidence in Chief, as follows:

- (a) Through further discussion with Mr Murray, and as documented in the Joint Witness Statement – Traffic and Transport (24 May 2017) (**JWS**), I was satisfied that the issues I raised in respect to Church Street could be adequately addressed through the proposed conditions.¹
- (b) Mr Nancekivell addressed the issue I raised related to the safety and efficiency of the layout proposed for Galway Link and associated intersections, and demonstrated an alternative layout which is to be considered in detailed design². As such I am satisfied that, the conditions referred to in relation to Church Street would allow this to be addressed in detailed design.

¹ JWS Traffic and Transport expert conference, Section 3.6

² Rebuttal of Mr Nancekivell, para 6.1-6.2, Attachment B

-
- (c) The rebuttal of Mr Nancekivell also refers to the amended layout for the parking and turning head on Hugo Johnston Drive³ which resolves the concerns I raised in my evidence.
- (d) Further discussion related to the intention of the Agency to work collaboratively with Auckland Transport to ensure the retention of a suitable Over-dimension Vehicle Route has addressed my concern at the loss of Sylvia Park Road as a suitable route.
3. Within my evidence I raised a concern that the conditions related to the consideration of cyclists during the construction period was lacking in detail and scope. Whilst within the JWS we agreed on the relevant factors, the draft conditions have resulted in those explicit factors being tied to a single location. However subsequent discussions with the Applicant and Auckland Transport, whom approve the construction management plans, have established that they consider the relevant conditions to be adequate, and there is a process in place to respond to the issues I raise.
4. As a result of this, there is only one issue that is outstanding which is unresolved, and that is my view that the footpath on the southern side of Sylvia Park Road should be implemented at 3.0m as a shared use path, some 1.2m wider than the Applicant Proposes. It is my view that the widening is required for safety and amenity, not for cyclists travelling east –west where the Karetu path would provide the more logical route, but for those connecting to Great South Road. I demonstrated this specific issue in Figure 2 of my evidence-in-chief, and tabulated in para 2.8 of my rebuttal.

³ Rebuttal of Mr Nancekivell, para 6.4, and Sheet 4 of the updated drawing set.