

**BEFORE A BOARD OF INQUIRY
NORTHERN CORRIDOR PROPOSAL**

UNDER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of notices of requirement for designation and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Proposal (the **Proposal**)

**SUMMARY OF TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT EVIDENCE OF ANDREW
SHELTON MAULE
20 July 2017**



Simpson Grierson

Barristers & Solicitors

G C Lanning / W M Bangma / D W Simpson

Telephone: +64-9-358 2222

Facsimile: +64-9-307 0331

Email: gerald.lanning@simpsongrierson.com

DX CX10921

Private Bag 92518

Auckland

1. My Name is Andrew Shelton Maule. I am the Bus Services Manager in the AT Metro (public transport) Division at Auckland Transport (**AT**). My experience is section in section 1 of my evidence.
2. In summary, my evidence in chief (**EIC**) identifies potential effects arising from the construction of the Northern Corridor Improvements proposal (**the proposal**) on buses. This includes:
 - (a) Disruptions to bus services (i.e. Northern Express) interfacing with the proposal. This is set out in section 6.2 to 6.9 of my evidence;
 - (b) Specific disruptions to bus services associated with the temporary closures (i.e. Paul Matthews Road); and
 - (c) Disruptions to bus services through the upgrade of Constellation Station and construction in the vicinity of Albany station.
3. In section 8.2 of my evidence, I concluded that the aim for the proposal should be to avoid adverse effects on buses during construction if at all possible. If this is not possible I consider they should be managed through a high level of involvement of AT in the construction management process, and specific limits set on the delays that buses may suffer relative to general traffic.
4. I attended the expert conferencing on transport and traffic – construction and transport and traffic – general and signed the respective joint witnessing statements (JWS) dated 23 and 26 June 2017. I have read the relevant transport evidence, rebuttal evidence and other JWS joint witnessing statements. There is nothing in these documents that change the views I have expressed in my EIC.
5. In particular, I support the changes to the CTMP conditions set out in the planning joint witness statement subject to one change, including:
 - 5.1 Amendments to CTMP.2 to place emphasis on minimising delays to public transport, especially at peak traffic periods during weekdays;
 - 5.2 Amendments to CTMP.3(a) to require consultation with AT Metro and that any AT comments not acted on are provided within the final CTMP when submitted to Council;

5.3 Amendments to CTMP.4(d)(ii) to retain the existing bus priority between Constellation and Albany busway stations and minimising adverse effects on buses for temporary closures in respect of (d)(iii) and (iv);

5.4 Addition of CTMP.6 to 6.D, which sets up a process through the preparation of a Public Transport Traffic Management Plan (PTTMP) to:

- (a) Consult with AT on managing the adverse effects of construction on bus services interfacing with the proposal;
- (b) Agree with AT acceptable performance thresholds to be sustained to maintain an agreed level of service and to agreed destinations;
- (c) Monitoring of those thresholds in agreement with AT;
- (d) A review of traffic management measures where the thresholds are not being met. However, I do consider that AT should be involved in this review process where the thresholds are not being met and condition CTMP.6D should be amended accordingly. This is because AT is the potentially affected party and has specialist knowledge in the planning and operation of the bus network.

6. With the amendment I propose to CTMP.6D above, I consider the proposed CTMP conditions setup a framework for ongoing consultation with AT to ensure the construction of the proposal appropriately manages potential effects on buses.

Dated at Auckland this 20th day of July 2017.



Andrew Shelton Maule
On behalf of Auckland Transport