

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

**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 Northern Corridor Improvements roading proposal in Auckland.

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ALASTAIR LOVELL ON BEHALF OF AUCKLAND  
TRANSPORT  
PLANNING**

**CONTENTS**

<b>CLAUSE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND EXPERIENCE.....	2
2. CODE OF CONDUCT .....	3
3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE.....	3
4. AT INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT GOING FORWARD .....	4
5. PUBLIC TRANSPORT – NORTHERN BUSWAY AND STATIONS .....	6
6. LOCAL ROAD NETWORK .....	7
7. WALKING AND CYCLING .....	8
8. CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS .....	10
9. STATUTORY ASSESMENT OF THE NCI PROJECT TRANSPORT EFFECTS..	16
10. CONCLUSION .....	17

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My full name is Alastair Douglas Lovell. I am the Statutory Planning Leader within the Strategy and Investment Division at Auckland Transport (**AT**). In this role, I manage the team which represents AT's interests in third party planning processes such as plan changes and notices of requirement (**NoRs**). My team and I have been working on the Northern Corridor Improvement (**NCI**) project for approximately 6 months since the NoRs and resource consent applications were lodged with the Environmental Protection Agency.
- 1.2 I hold a Master of Planning (Distinction) and a Bachelor of Planning from the University of Auckland. I have over 17 years' experience in public and private sector planning roles in New Zealand and overseas. In this time I have worked in most areas of planning including strategy and policy development through to NoRs, resource consents and compliance.
- 1.3 Over the last 12 years I have specialized in infrastructure planning and have extensive experience in the areas of transport and designations. Some of the more relevant projects I have been involved in include:
- (a) Leading AT's involvement in the Auckland Unitary Plan, including managing a team of experts, developing policy and giving evidence before the Independent Hearings Panel;
  - (b) Leading Auckland Council's rollover of over 1600 designations and 50 new NoRs into the PAUP, including managing a team of planners and engaging with 30 different requiring authorities;
  - (c) Leading the planning on the initial route options assessment for the southern sector of the Puhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance;
  - (d) Leading the planning for the design and construction phases of the Northern Gateway Toll Road, SH20-1 Manukau Extension and SH1 East Taupo Arterial; and
  - (e) Supporting the lead planner on the SH20 Manukau Harbour Crossing and the North Shore City Council's Northern Busway funding application to Infrastructure Auckland.

- 1.4 As set out in (d) above, I also have considerable experience managing the implementation of planning requirements during the design and construction phases of major transport projects. This has included advising transport agencies and contractors on compliance with designations and resource consent, preparing management plans and the outline plans.

## 2. CODE OF CONDUCT

- 2.1 While I am an employee of AT, I confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

## 3. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 My evidence is given in support of AT's submission on the **NCI** project. AT's position in its submission was one of strong support of the project and its transport benefit, subject to fully understanding its effects, and ensuring there are appropriate measures or conditions in place manage any such effects and AT's interests.

- 3.2 My evidence therefore focuses on the transport effects of the NCI project and those matters of specific interest to AT in fulfilling its role of contributing to an "effective, efficient and safe Auckland land transport system in the public interest"<sup>1</sup>. In particular my evidence will address the:

- (a) AT's ongoing involvement in the NCI project, including the development of the detailed design, management plans and outline plan;
- (b) Effects on public transport effects, including the Northern Busway extension, and existing and future stations;
- (c) Effects on the local road network;

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, section 39.

- (d) Effects on walking and cycling, including connectivity with the local transport network and safety;
- (e) Effects of construction traffic management, including traffic displacement, road closures, buses, disruption, park and rides and local road damage; and
- (f) Statutory framework for considering the transport effects of the NCI project.

**3.3** New and amended designation conditions are proposed where I consider these are necessary to manage the actual and potential effects of the NCI project. These are included in **Attachment A** to this evidence.

**3.4** My evidence should be read in conjunction with that of the other AT witnesses listed below, and I defer to their expertise where necessary and relevant:

- (a) Mr Daniel Newcombe (corporate);
- (b) Mr Anthony Cross (public transport - strategic);
- (c) Mr Andrew Maul (public transport – operational and construction);
- (d) Ms Kathryn King (walking and cycling); and
- (e) Mr Martin Peake (transport – operational and construction)

#### **4. AT INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT GOING FORWARD**

**4.1** AT's submission noted that NZTA had given assurances of AT's involvement in the detailed design and approval stages of the NCI project. The evidence of Mr Newcombe has explained that a Framework Agreement is being prepared with NZTA to address these matters but has yet to be formalized, although it is hoped that this will occur prior the hearing.

**4.2** AT has a number of different roles and interests in the NCI project:

- (a) Asset manager on behalf of Auckland Council of the local transport networks, including roads, Northern Busway stations, park and rides, and walking and cycling;
- (b) Planning and funding of the public transport services that will use the SH1 and SH18, the Northern Busway and its extension;

- (c) Future maintenance operator for parts of the NCI project, namely the Shared Use Path; and
- (d) Delivery partner in respect of the future Rosedale Busway Station;
- (e) Requiring authority for several busway designations and a lodged NoR for the local road network;
- (f) Road Controlling Authority (**RCA**) and "corridor manager" for the local road network in respect of the National Code of Practice for Network Utility Operators' Access to Transport Corridors (the **Code**) and the administration of this and The Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (**COPTTM**), through the Corridor Access Request (**CAR**) process; and
- (g) Involvement in the Engineering Approvals Process (**EAP**) for vesting transport assets in Auckland Council for AT management.

**4.3** The NZTA will need various approvals from AT prior to undertaking any works seeking to modify any assets managed by AT, including asset manager, requiring authority, corridor CAR approvals and the EAP. From my perspective it would be preferential to have a more robust, engaged and streamlined process with NZTA for these approvals. This could be developed outside of the designation.

**4.4** Within the extent of the NoR, AT has less influence over the NCI project although there are elements that will affect local transport networks. It is therefore important, in my view, that AT can provide input and feedback into these key elements of the project as the detailed design is developed. A similar approach has been proposed by the NZTA on the East West Link (**EWL**) designation conditions to address the integration of that project with the local transport networks and future projects.

**4.5** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions for the NCI project, and have proposed new designation condition X.1 as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

## 5. PUBLIC TRANSPORT – NORTHERN BUSWAY AND STATIONS

5.1 AT's submission, and the evidence of Mr Newcombe and Mr Cross, strongly supports the Northern Busway extension and the improvements to the existing busway stations and future busway station. Their evidence also set outs the strategic documents<sup>2</sup> of relevance to the busway extension, and its alignment with the direction to improve core public transport provision on the North Shore.

5.2 Mr Newcombe in particular has also raised a number of design matters and/or actual and potential effects of the NCI project in respect of the busway extension and the existing and future stations. These include:

- (a) The design of the busway extension to accommodate future Mass Rapid Transit (**MRT**) options such as advanced bus and light rail transit;
- (b) The design of the busway is future proofed for its further extension north along SH1 beyond Albany;
- (c) The design of the busway extension integrates with the existing busway stations and future busway station; and
- (d) Collaboration between AT and NZTA in respect of the design of the motorway and the future busway station between Constellation and Albany busways station (the preferred station location is Rosedale).

5.3 I consider these design matters and/or effects of the NCI project are significant enough to be addressed during the development of the detailed design and outline plan. I have therefore proposed a new condition X.2, which sets out the key transport outcomes to be delivered by the NCI project at the outline plan. Again, this is also an approach adopted by the NZTA in the EWL.

5.4 The need to consult with AT on the detailed design and outline plan has previously been addressed in paragraph 4.5 of the evidence above and my proposed new designation condition X.1. Again, this approach has been proposed by the NZTA on the EWL NoR to address the integration of that project with local transport networks and future projects.

---

<sup>2</sup> Auckland Plan, Auckland Transport Alignment Project, Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan.

5.5 I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions for the NCI project, as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

## 6. LOCAL ROAD NETWORK

6.1 AT's submission on the NCI project noted that a detailed review of the NZTA's updated transport model had not been undertaken. This review has now been completed as part of Mr Peake's evidence and he is largely comfortable with the extent of the traffic effects on the local road network.

6.2 However, there are actual and potential effects on the local road network as a result of the NCI project, which Mr Peake has identified require further consideration and mitigation measures. These include:

- (a) The significant effects on Oteha Valley Road and the Oteha Interchange from additional traffic volumes generated by the NCI, and the need to consider upgrades for this part of the network;
- (b) The effects on McClymonts Road bridge resulting from (a) above, and the need to consider expanding this bridge to four lanes as an alternative to upgrades to Oteha Valley Road and the interchange; and
- (c) The effects on Albany Highway south of the Upper Harbour Highway (SH18) from additional traffic volumes generated by the NCI, and the need to bring forward an upgrade project to address these effects.

6.3 Given that these effects and mitigation measures identified above have not specifically been addressed as part of the NCI project, I consider that these need to be explored further by the NZTA and the transport experts at conferencing prior to the hearing. Subject to the outcomes of that process, I consider that these mitigation measures should be incorporated into the NCI project by extending the designation over the affected local roads and amending my new proposed condition X.2, which sets out key transport outcomes to be delivered by the NCI project in the outline plan.

- 6.4** If a decision was made not to extend the designation over affected local roads, those mitigation measures outside the notified designation could be addressed by a proposed new designation condition X.3 on the designation requiring that those mitigation measures outside the designation are completed prior to the opening of the project.
- 6.5** In either case, I can confirm that AT is willing to provide the NZTA access to the road corridor to deliver these mitigation measures and agree to the extent of the designation being extended over those parts of the affected local road network provided the designation is removed at the end of the project. I have proposed new designation condition X.4 to address this, which also follows the approach adopted by the NZTA on the EWL.
- 6.6** In terms of feasibility, should the designation not be extended, the road corridor at both these locations on Oteha Valley Road and McClymonts Road are reasonably wide and land acquisitions may not be required. The AUP local road rules also enable road widening although consents may be required for earthworks and potentially stormwater depending on the current level of treatment in place.
- 6.7** In respect of Albany Highway, this is an identified future project albeit not within the next 10 year funding period. The extent of this project could be considerable depending on the scope of work identified. I consider that a condition requiring the NZTA to work with AT to prioritize the planning and funding of this project would be most appropriate in this instance. This is addressed in proposed condition X.5.
- 6.8** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

## **7. WALKING AND CYCLING**

- 7.1** AT's submission and the evidence of Ms King strongly supports the improved walking and cycling links to be provided as part of the NCI project. In particular she notes:

- (a) The Shared Use Path will implement a key 'metro' north-south and east-west segments of the Auckland Cycle Network Plan; and
- (b) It will link key destinations, most notably the existing and future Northern Busway stations.

**7.2** Ms King in her evidence notes that the detailed design stage will be crucial in terms of determining the level of service, treatments and amenity on each connection with the local walking and cycling network. This in turn will determine how usable, safe and attractive the Shared Use Path and its connections to the local network are for cyclists. In this respect, both Ms King and Mr Peake in his evidence have identified that the absence of sufficient connection to the local cycling network is a major concern and may reduce/delay the benefits expected as part of the NCI project.

**7.3** The key locations where connection and safety and convenience improvements to the shared use path and local road network could be made include:

- (a) Along Oteha Valley Road to the existing shared path (northern side) and cycle path (southern side) to the west of the interchange and the soon to be constructed Medallion Drive cycle facilities to the east;
- (b) Separation of walking and cycling facilities on McClymonts Road bridge;
- (c) Safe crossing facilities at the intersections of McClymonts Road with Elliot Rose Avenue and Don McKinnon Drive. The Elliot Rose Avenue intersection may require signalisation;
- (d) Conveniently located bike racks near the Shared Use Path at Constellation Busway Station;
- (e) Along Caribbean Drive to the edge of the designation;
- (f) Pedestrian and cyclist priority facilities across the slip lanes at the intersections with Caribbean Drive and Albany Highway;
- (g) Pedestrian and cyclist separation facilities on the Paul Mathews Road bridge;
- (h) Improvements to the safety and design of connections into and through Alexandra Reserve;
- (i) Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths located to the north of the interchange in the vicinity of Bush Road; and

- (j) Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths/lanes located to the south of the interchange in the vicinity of Upper Harbour Drive.

**7.4** Again, given that these effects and the mitigation measures identified above have not specifically been addressed as part of the NCI, I consider these matters need to be explored further by the NZTA and the transport experts at conferencing prior to the hearing. Subject to the outcome of the process, I consider that these mitigation measures should be incorporated into the NCI project.

**7.5** The same options apply in respect to these mitigation measures inside and outside the designation as set out in paragraph 6.4 above in relation to affected parts of local road network. The options include extending the notified designation and/or proposed new designation conditions X.2 and X.3.

**7.6** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

## **8. CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS**

**8.1** AT's submission raised a number of matters in respect to the management of the transport network during the construction of the NCI project. The most significant of these are the displacement of State Highway traffic onto the local road network and the disruption to public transport.

**8.2** Mr Maule and Mr Peake's evidence in particular identify the actual and potential effects of construction traffic management. These include:

- (a) The displacement of traffic from SH1 and SH18 onto the local road network due to reduced capacity during construction;
- (b) Temporary road closures of SH18 and SH1 and the restriction of right turn movements on SH18 at Paul Matthews Road;
- (c) Temporary loss of car parking at Albany park and ride;
- (d) Pedestrians access at Rosedale Road under SH1;
- (e) Potential damage to local roads caused by construction vehicles;

- (f) Alternative over-dimension and over-weight routes; and
- (g) Importantly, the impact on bus services.

**8.3** These effects are addressed in turn below. Mr Peake has also suggested some amendments to conditions CTMP.3, 3(d), 3(d)(ii) and (iii), and 4(b), which I have not specifically addressed below. I support these minor changes to clarify expectations in respect of minimizing the effects of construction traffic management and temporary road closures, as set out in **Attachment A** to this evidence.

**8.4** I also need to make clear that I consider that the appropriate means for addressing transport effects, including the effects of construction traffic management is through the designation and not resource consents. Transport effects are addressed in the district plan section of the AUP and there are activities enabled under the designation that would not necessarily need a resource consent but could generate transport effects. In my opinion the construction traffic management conditions should be moved from the resource consent conditions to the designation conditions.

#### **Displacement of Traffic from SH1 and SH18**

**8.5** Mr Peake identified in his evidence that the construction traffic effects appear to be relatively minor on the travel times on the State highways but there is no information on the local road network, particularly the arterial roads set out in paragraph 6.12 of his evidence.

**8.6** To address actual and potential effects, Mr Peake considers more information is required on the forecast distribution of traffic during construction, particularly at peak times, to determine whether additional mitigation measures are required on the local road network. He considers this can be addressed by amending existing condition CTMP.3 to require the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMTP) to:

- (a) Assess the effect on the local road network (and as a minimum those arterials roads noted in paragraph 6.2 of this evidence) of traffic

management measures on SH1 and SH18 through appropriate traffic modelling, including detailed modelling of intersections;

- (b) Identify ways to minimise delays to road users, including public transport, pedestrians and cyclists; and
- (c) Where works on SH1 and SH18 are identified as having effects on local roads, AT shall be consulted and provide input into the development of any Traffic Management Plan (TMP) including approval of any mitigation measures.

**8.7** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

#### **Temporary closures on SH1, SH18 and Paul Matthews Road**

**8.8** Mr Peake's evidence explains the considerable volume of traffic that would be displaced and disrupted by temporary roads closures on SH1, SH18 and right turn movements out of Paul Mathews Drive. This includes diverting traffic and in particular bus services onto other already congested arterial roads and intersections with limited opportunity for diversion routes. Buses in particular will be experience delays and increased travel distances.

**8.9** Amendments to condition CTMP 3 have been proposed by Mr Peake to ensure that the effects of banned movements at Paul Matthews Road are appropriately assessed including:

- (a) An assessment of where traffic from Paul Matthews Road is displaced due to the closure;
- (b) Analysis of the effects of the displaced traffic on critical intersections and roads along the diversion route, including traffic modelling where appropriate;
- (c) Analysis of the effects of re-routed buses;
- (d) Identify mitigation measures required to address the effects of the closure for general vehicles, buses and pedestrians and cyclists; and
- (e) The assessment and mitigation measures should be to the satisfaction of AT.

**8.10** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

### **Albany Park and Ride Car Parking**

**8.11** Mr Peake explains in his evidence that a reduction in car parking at Albany park and ride would likely result in:

- (a) Inconvenience for users of the facility thereby impacting on the ability for commuters to use public transport;
- (b) Possible increase in vehicle movements on the motorway and local road network; and
- (c) Displaced parking to other locations.

**8.12** A new condition is recommended by Mr Peake to ensure that the number of car parks at the park and ride site, or provided on an alternate nearby site, is maintained throughout the construction period. I note that there have been discussions between AT and NZTA and nearby site investigated to accommodate a temporary park and ride.

**8.13** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as new condition X.6 set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

### **Footpaths along Rosedale Road**

**8.14** Mr Peake in his evidence considers that at least one pedestrian path on Rosedale Road beneath the SH1 over bridge should remain open at all time, and preferably a cycling facility too. This in addition to the one vehicle lane proposed by NZTA.

**8.15** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as amended condition 3(d)(v) set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

### **Damage by Construction Vehicles**

**8.16** Mr Peake in his evidence explains that an increase in heavy construction vehicle movements on the local road networks, particularly around the accesses to the Construction Support Areas (CSA), has the potential to cause damage to roads. Local roads not designed to carry concentrated volumes of heavy vehicles are particularly at risk and this includes the access roads to the CSAs.

**8.17** To manage this adverse effect, Mr Peake recommends a new condition to ensure that:

- (a) CSA access and haul routes are identified in the CTMP;
- (b) The local road network along these identified routes are assessed pre-construction;
- (c) The affected roads are monitored on a regular basis; and
- (d) Repairs are undertaken, to AT's satisfaction, in a timely fashion.

**8.18** AT has standard preferred conditions that have been used on other projects to ensure that damage to local roads associated with concentrated heavy vehicles associated with the construction works is identified and repaired. This approach has also been accepted by the NZTA on the EWL project and I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as new condition X.7 set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

### **Over-dimension and Over-weight Routes**

**8.19** In his evidence Mr Peake has recommended a new condition to manage any diversion to the over-dimension and over-weights routes. I support this approach and Mr Peake's suggestion that the NZTA should identify alternative routes where existing over-dimension and over-weight vehicle routes are affected during construction, and AT and the freight industry should be consulted.

**8.20** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as new condition X.8 set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

### **Impact on Bus Services during Construction**

**8.21** The evidence of Mr Cross, and Mr Maule deals with the importance of the bus services along the Northern Busway and the new bus network in the area. I rely on their evidence and Mr Peake in relation to the effects on buses during

construction and in particular the importance on rapid bus services operating on the Northern Busway.

**8.22** Mr Peake explains in his evidence that disruptions to public transport would likely result in:

- (a) Inconvenience for users of the facility thereby impacting on the ability for commuters to use public transport;
- (b) Loss of patronage on the bus services as experienced during the construction of the Western Ring Route; and
- (c) Possible increase in vehicle movements on the motorway and local road network.

**8.23** Overall, Mr Peake considers that the existing proposed conditions are generally inadequate in dealing with the effects on bus services, as no mitigation measures have been identified. He considers new condition is required to ensure that:

- (a) Pre-construction bus travel times and reliability are surveyed to set a bench mark for monitoring the effects on buses due to construction;
- (b) Travel times and reliability of bus services are surveyed at regular intervals (at least every 6 months) during construction;
- (c) A maximum of level of additional delay to bus travel times and reliability should be specified; and
- (d) The NZTA should liaise with AT in agreeing appropriate mitigation measures, which shall include bus priority and additional buses.

**8.24** Mr Maule also notes that diversion routes for double decker buses service on local roads have not been identified on the North Shore, This would need a safety survey and possible improvement before double decker services could be diverted safely onto those roads.

**8.25** I support this approach also being incorporated into the designation conditions, as new condition X.9 set out in **Attachment A** to my evidence.

## 9. STATUTORY ASSESSMENT

9.1 Section 168 and 171 relates to the decision of a requiring authority. When making its recommendation on the NoR, the Board of Inquiry must consider Part 2 of the RMA, any submissions received and the effects on the environment having particular regard to:

- (a) *any relevant provisions of—*
  - (i) *a national policy statement;*
  - (ii) *a New Zealand coastal policy statement;*
  - (iii) *a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement;*
  - (iv) *a plan or proposed plan; and*
- (b) *whether adequate consideration has been given to alternative sites, routes, or methods of undertaking the work if—*
  - (i) *the requiring authority does not have an interest in the land sufficient for undertaking the work; or*
  - (ii) *it is likely that the work will have a significant adverse effect on the environment; and*
- (c) *whether the work and designation are reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought; and*
- (d) *any other matter the territorial authority considers reasonably necessary in order to make a decision on the requirement.*

9.2 I largely agree with the statutory assessment set out in the NZTA's Assessment of Environmental Effects for the NCI project, and the associated planning evidence of Mr Burn and Mr McGahagan on behalf of NZTA. I support the significant positive transport effects of the NCI project identified in the transport evidence of Mr Clarke for NZTA, including:

- (a) Improvement in travel times on the motorway network and an overall decrease in traffic flows on some local roads;
- (b) Faster and more reliable bus journeys through the Northern Busway extension to the Albany busway station;
- (c) Increased safety for users of the State highway and local road network resulting from proposed the safety improvements; and
- (d) Greater opportunity and connectivity for cycling and walking.

10. The provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan (**AUP**) are most relevant to transport and includes enabling regional policy statement and district plan and

includes objectives and policies<sup>3</sup>, which support the development of transport infrastructure and avoidance, remedying or mitigation of actual and potential effects.

**10.1** With respect to the actual and potential effects, where there are specific transport effects or bottom lines that need to be managed as part of a NCI project, my preference is to address these in the designation as conditions. At this stage the NZTA's designation conditions for managing transport effects appears light. Reliance would therefore need to be placed on the outline plan provisions under section 176A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**), and in particular subsection (3)(f): "any other matters to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects on the environment". In my experience, by themselves, outline plans are a fairly weak tool for addressing any substantive effects of a designation, particularly large and complex projects. The new and amended condition set out in **Attachment A** are included on that basis, although I would have no objection to these matters being addressed through a separate agreement with NZTA.

**10.2** For these reasons, and subject to any potential or actual transport effects of the NCI project being appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated, I consider that section 5(2)(c) of the RMA will be satisfied. Accordingly, the Project will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations particularly in respect of all modes of transport and the related economic and community benefits. I therefore consider the project to be consistent with the purpose of the RMA.

## **11. CONCLUSION**

**12.** My evidence recognises the significant transport benefits of the NCI project for all modes. I have focused on the designation conditions required to mitigate the transport effects on the matters of specific interest to AT. I have recommended a number of amendments to the designation conditions. I consider that these proposed amendments will ensure that the transport

---

<sup>3</sup> Auckland Unitary Plan: objectives B3.2.1(8), B3.3.1(1), E26.2.1(4-5), (9), E27.2(1-3), (5); and policies B3.2.2 (3), B3.3.2(7), E26.2.2(1-2), (4-5), and (14), E27.3(13-14).

effects of the proposal can be appropriately managed, and that integration with the wider transport network including future projects can be achieved.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alastair Lovell', written in a cursive style.

Alastair Lovell

25 May 2017

## Attachment A – Proposed designation conditions

Amendment to the NZTA conditions are ~~strike through~~ or underlined.

<p><b><u>Transport</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Involvement of Auckland Transport in the preparation of detailed design</u></b></p> <p><u>X.1 The Requiring Authority shall consult with, and seek the input of, Auckland Transport during the preparation of the detailed design and outline plan(s) of works in relation to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>The design of the busway, busway stations and any future busway station;</u></li> <li>(b) <u>Local roads, including walking and cycling and public transport facilities, and other interfaces between the State Highway and local transport networks;</u></li> <li>(c) <u>Compliance with relevant Auckland Transport codes of practice and engineering standards for any assets to be vested in Auckland Transport;</u></li> <li>(d) <u>Accommodating the transport projects identified in condition X.2 and X.3 and X.3; and</u></li> <li>(e) <u>The Construction Traffic Management Plan and any Traffic Management Plans.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The Outline Plan(s) shall describe how the input from Auckland Transport has been incorporated into the design also Auckland Transport comments and the reasons where any such input has not been incorporated.</u></p>
<p><b><u>Outline Plan of Works</u></b></p> <p><u>X.2 As part of the Outline Plan(s) prepared under section 176A of the RMA, the Requiring Authority shall demonstrate how the following outcomes will be achieved for the relevant stage of the Project for which the Outline Plan has been submitted:</u></p> <p><u>Busway and stations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>The Northern Busway extension and its structures are designed to support future Mass Rapid Transit options (i.e. advanced bus or light rail transit);</u></li> <li>(b) <u>Consideration is given to the need to widen the Rosedale overbridge piers to support the upgrade of Rosedale Road for to four lanes with bus and walking and cycling priority, as part of the safe and efficient operation the future Rosedale busway station proposal;</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Traffic and local roads</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(c) <u>The safe and efficient operation/design/upgrade of Oteha Valley Road between Munroe Lane and Oteha Valley Road interchange to include ... [placeholder condition dependent on the expert conferencing];</u></li> <li>(d) <u>The safe and efficient operation/design/upgrade of MyClymonts Road and bridge to four lanes and any consequential improvements to the intersections with Don McKinnon Drive, Elliot Rose Avenue and Medallion Drive ... [placeholder condition dependent on the expert conferencing];</u></li> </ul>

Shared Use path and local walking and cycling facilities

- (e) The safe and efficient design of the Shared Use Path, including:
- (f) The provision of safe and efficient connections between the Shared Use Path and the local walking and cycling network including:
  - I. Along Oteha Valley Road to the existing shared path (northern side) and cycle path (southern side) are located to the west of the interchange;
  - II. Through the Constellation Busway Station to Sunset Road, if practicable;
  - III. Along Caribbean Drive to the edge of the designation;
  - IV. Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths located to the north of the interchange in the vicinity of Bush Road;
  - V. Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths/lanes located to the south of the interchange in the vicinity of Upper Harbour Drive;
- (g) The provision of safety and convenience improvements on the Shared Use Path and local walking and cycling network, including:
  - I. Safe crossing facilities at the intersections of McClymonts Road with Elliot Rose Avenue and Don McKinnon Drive. The Elliot Rose Avenue intersection may require signalisation;
  - II. Protected cycle facilities along McClymonts Road;
  - III. Conveniently located bike racks near the Shared Use Path at Constellation Busway Station;
  - IV. Pedestrian and cyclist priority facilities across the slip lanes at the intersections with Caribbean Drive and Albany Highway;
  - V. Pedestrian and cyclist separation facilities on the Paul Mathews Road bridge;
  - VI. Improvements to the safety and design of connections into and through Alexandra Reserve;

**Works outside the designation if the extent of the designation is not increased to address the mitigation measures identified in X.2**

X.3 Prior to the completion of the Northern Corridor Improvements project, the following mitigation measures shall be operational:

Traffic and local roads

- (a) The safe and efficient operation/design/upgrade of Oteha Valley Road between Munroe Lane and Oteha Valley Road interchange to include ... [placeholder condition dependent on the expert conferencing];
- (b) The safe and efficient operation/design/upgrade of MyClymonts Road and bridge to four lanes and any consequential improvements to the intersections with Don McKinnon Drive, Elliot Rose Avenue and Medallion Drive ... [placeholder condition dependent on the expert conferencing];

Shared Use path and local walking and cycling facilities

- (c) The provision of safe and efficient connections between the Shared Use Path and the local walking and cycling network including:
  - I. Along Oteha Valley Road to the existing shared path (northern side) and cycle path (southern side) to the west of the interchange and the future cycle facility on Medallion Drive;
  - II. Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths located to the north of the interchange in the vicinity of Bush Road;
  - III. Along Albany Highway to the existing cycle paths/lanes located to the south of

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>the interchange in the vicinity of Upper Harbour Drive;</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The provision of safety and convenience improvements on the Shared Use Path and local walking and cycling network, including:</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">IV. <u>Pedestrian and cyclist priority facilities across the slip lanes at the intersections with Caribbean Drive and Albany Highway;</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">V. <u>Improvements to the safety and design of connections into and through Alexandra Reserve; and</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">VI. <u>Pedestrian and cyclist separation facilities on the Paul Mathews Road bridge.</u></p>
<p><b><u>Removal of the designation</u></b></p> <p>X.4 <u>As soon as practicable following Completion of Construction, the Requiring Authority shall:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Review the extent of the area designated for the Project;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Identify any areas of designated land that are no longer necessary for the on-going operation, maintenance or mitigation of effects of the Project and/or are to be managed as part of the local road network by Auckland Transport; and</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Identify any areas of designated land that apply to local roads to be vested in Auckland Council; and</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Give notice to the Council Manager in accordance with section 182 of the RMA for the removal of those parts of the designation identified in (b) and (c) above.</u></p>
<p><b><u>Albany Highway (South)</u></b></p> <p>X.5 <u>Prior to the opening of the Northern Corridor Improvements project, the Requiring Authority shall:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Investigate the extent of any upgrades needed to Albany Highway south of interchange to support the NCI project;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Identify the timing of when any identified upgrades are needed; and</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Confirm the funding of any required upgrades has been prioritised and will be completed by .... [placeholder condition dependent on the expert conferencing].</u></p>
<p><b><u>Construction Traffic Management</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>Construction Traffic Management Plan</u></b></p> <p>CTMP.1 A CTMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified person and shall be submitted as part of the CEMP.</p>
<p>CTMP.2 <del>The purpose of the CTMP is to manage the potential impacts of the construction of the NCI Project on the transportation network during the construction period.</del></p> <p><u>The purpose of the CTMP is to manage the various traffic management, safety and efficiency effects associated with the Construction Works to:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Protect public safety including the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists;</u></p> <p>b) <u>Minimise delays to road users, , pedestrians and cyclists, and particularly public transport; and</u></p> <p>c) <u>Inform the public about any potential impacts on the road network.</u></p>

CTMP.3 The CTMP shall describe the methods for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the local and network wide transportation effects resulting from construction of the NCI Project, and will address, as far as practicable, the following matters:

a. Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the local and network wide effects of the construction of individual elements of the NCI Project (e.g. intersections/overbridges) and the use of staging to allow sections of the NCI Project to be opened to traffic while other sections are still under construction;

b. Methods to manage the effects of the delivery of construction material, plant and machinery (including oversized trucks);

c. The numbers, frequencies, routes and timing of construction traffic movements;

d. Traffic management measures to address and maintain traffic capacity as far as reasonably practicable and minimise adverse effects, including on bus services and bus travel times, at peak traffic periods during weekdays (06:30 to 09:30 and 16:00 to 19:00), inter peak on weekdays and also weekends, including:

i. Retaining the existing number of traffic lanes along SH1 (between Tristram Avenue and Oteha Valley Road);

ii. Retaining the extent of existing bus priority measures along SH1 (between the Albany Station and the Constellation Station), as far as reasonably practicable and subject to the requirement that the bus only on ramp from McClymonts Road and the bus only access to the Constellation Station may need to be temporarily closed. Any temporary closure will minimise adverse effects on buses and general traffic. The duration of any temporary closure shall be minimised as far as reasonably practicable;

iii. Retaining the existing number of through traffic lanes along SH18 between the Upper Harbour interchange and the Albany Highway interchange, as far as reasonably practicable and subject to the requirement that right turning movements to and from Paul Matthews Road may need to be temporarily closed. Any temporary closure will minimise adverse effects on buses and general traffic. The duration of any temporary closure shall be minimised as far as reasonably practicable;

iv. Retaining two traffic lanes on McClymonts Road, over SH1, as far as reasonably practicable and subject to the requirement that temporary restrictions to one lane or temporary full closures may be required; and

v. Retaining at least one traffic lane and one footpath on Rosedale Road, under SH1, ~~as far as~~ and where reasonably practicable facilities for cyclists should also be provided. This single lane is to allow two way traffic, with signalised shuttle working.

e. Measures to maintain existing vehicle access to private properties, as far as possible, or where the existing property access is to be removed or becomes unsafe as a result of the construction works, measures to provide alternative access arrangements in consultation with Council (Team Leader Northern Monitoring) and the affected landowner; and

f. Measures to maintain pedestrian and cycle access with thoroughfare to be maintained on all roads and footpaths adjacent to the construction works, where practicable (e.g. unless provision of such access is severed by the works or such access will become unsafe as a result of the construction works). Such access shall be safe, clearly identifiable, provide permanent surfacing and seek to minimise significant detours.

g. Measures to assess the effect on the local road network of traffic management measures on SH1 and SH18 including:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. <u>Modelling, including detailed modelling of intersections, as a minimum the following arterial roads:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Oteha Valley Road, including the interchange at SH1;</u></li> <li>• <u>Albany Expressway;</u></li> <li>• <u>Greville Road;</u></li> <li>• <u>Albany Highway north and south of SH18 and including the interchange with SH18;</u></li> <li>• <u>Rosedale Road; and</u></li> <li>• <u>East Coast Road.</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>II. <u>Identifying ways to minimise delays to road users, including public transport, pedestrians and cyclists; and</u></li> <li>III. <u>Consulting Auckland Transport to provide input into the development of any Traffic Management Plan (TMP) including approval of any mitigation measures, where traffic management measures on SH1 and SH18 are identified as having an adverse effects on local roads.</u></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2. <u>h. Measures to assess the effects of temporary road closures of the State Highway or Paul Mathews Drives as set out in (d)(iii) above, including:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. <u>Analysis of the displaced traffic on critical intersections and roads along the diversion route, including traffic modelling where appropriate;</u></li> <li>II. <u>Analysis of the effects of re-routed buses including increased cost to AT in operating bus services;</u></li> <li>III. <u>Identifying mitigation measures to address the adverse effects of the closure for general vehicles, buses and pedestrians and cyclists; and</u></li> <li>IV. <u>The assessment and mitigation measures should be to the satisfaction of AT.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p>CTMP.4 The Consent Holder shall ensure that, when developing the CTMP, the suitably qualified person preparing the CTMP shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Use best practice to better understand the effects of construction of the NCI Project or NCI Project stage on the affected road network, which may include the use of traffic modelling tools. Any such assessment should be undertaken in consultation with Auckland Transport, and have the ability to simulate lane restrictions and road closures; and</li> <li>b. As far as practicable, include measures to avoid road closures and also the restriction of vehicle, bus, cycle and pedestrian movements.</li> </ol>
<p><b>3. <u>Albany Park and Ride</u></b></p> <p>4. <u>X. 6 The Requiring Authority shall ensure that the number of car parks is maintained at the Albany park and ride site or provided at an appropriate alternate nearby site, throughout the construction period.</u></p>
<p><b><u>Local roads used for access to construction yards</u></b></p> <p><u>X.7 The Requiring Authority shall:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>At least two weeks prior to works commencing on site, the Requiring Authority shall submit to Auckland Transport a RAMM visual condition assessment including a high-definition video and Pavement Strength Testing of local roads and arterial roads to be used for heavy vehicle access to and from the construction site, as identified in the CTMP</u></li> </ol>

in accordance with Condition CT.2(f) and as set out below.

- (b) The extent of local road affected shall include all local roads travelled until the nearest arterial road and including the intersection of that arterial road. If the site access is on an arterial road then the monitoring will be limited to 100m either side of the access. At least two weeks prior to works commencing on site, these local roads shall be monitored to identify the existing volume of heavy vehicles in operation prior to construction.
- (c) The Requiring Authority shall arrange a meeting with Auckland Transport to discuss the findings of the RAMM visual condition assessment and the results of the Pavement Strength Testing and monitoring results. The purpose of the meeting is to agree on the existing condition of the subject sections of the relevant local and arterial road.
- (d) The Requiring Authority shall monitor the relevant local roads to identify the existing volume of heavy vehicles in operation prior to construction and also undertake a visual assessment every three months, until such time that the heavy vehicles cease to be used on the local and arterial roads. A final inspection shall also be undertaken one week after the operation has ceased. The outcome of the visual assessment shall be provided to Auckland Transport.
- (e) Any damage to a local road and arterial road which is verified by Auckland Transport as being attributable to heavy vehicles entering or exiting construction sites shall be repaired within two weeks or within an alternative timeframe to be agreed with Auckland Transport. All repairs shall be undertaken by the requiring authority and shall be to the satisfaction of Auckland Transport.

5.

6. **Over-dimension and Over-weight Routes**

7. X. 8 The Requiring Authority shall identify alternative routes for over-dimension and over-weight vehicles where these routes are affected during construction, and consult Auckland Transport and the freight industry (including affected local businesses) on the alternative routes or closures.

#### **Disruption to buses**

X.9 The Requiring Authority shall:

- (a) Survey pre-construction bus travel times and reliability to set a bench mark for monitoring the effects on buses due to construction;
- (b) Survey the travel times and reliability of bus services at regular intervals (at least every 6 months) during construction;
- (c) Specify a maximum level of additional delay to bus travel times and reliability as part of the CTMP;
- (d) Liaise with Auckland Transport in agreeing appropriate mitigation measures, including the provision of additional bus services to reduce delays to customers; and
- (e) Undertake an audit of any proposed re-routed routes for double decker bus services and undertake works needed to make these routes safety compliant.

**Stakeholder and Communications Plan**

SCP.3 The SCP shall contain the following:

- a. Methods for informing the community of construction progress, including proposed hours of operation outside normal working hours and Project contact details;
- b. Identification of key stakeholders such as community groups, business groups, residents organisations, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Watercare Services Limited, Ministry of Education, the IIG and the local boards;
- c. The requirement to establish consultation processes involving:
  - i. Briefings for key stakeholders (including emergency services, business associations, local boards and road user groups) at least quarterly, ahead of all major milestones or road closures;
  - ii. Regular consultation events or information days, held as appropriate, to provide the opportunity for the community to have input into the NCI Project and construction impact strategies, and to also be informed in advance of upcoming works including closures and traffic management plans;
  - iii. The establishment of a Charter in accordance with the IAP2 guidelines to guide the role, timings and structure of the consultation events and information days;
  - iv. Notification of consultation events and information days to the public and community groups;
  - v. A requirement to publish and circulate records of consultation events and information days; and
  - vi. A requirement for the Consent Holder to ensure that appropriate personnel attend both the stakeholder and community events to explain the NCI Project programme and staging, how the effects are proposed to be managed and to respond to any questions.
- d. Details of the Community Liaison Manager to be appointed by the Consent Holder; and 84
- e. Details of the proposed engagement with the community in order to foster good relationships and to provide opportunities for learning about the NCI Project.