

**Before a Board of Inquiry
Northern Corridor Improvements Project**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

In the matter of a Board of Inquiry appointed under section 149J of the Act to consider notices of requirement for designations and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project

Summary statement of Shannon Bray for the New Zealand Transport Agency (Urban design, landscape and visual)

Dated 23 July 2017

KENSINGTON SWAN

18 Viaduct Harbour Avenue Ph +64 9 379 4196
Private Bag 92101 Fax +64 9 309 4276
Auckland 1142 DX CP22001

Solicitor: C M Sheard/N McIndoe
christina.sheard@kensingtonswan.com/nicky.mcindoe@kensingtonswan.com/

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SHANNON BRAY FOR THE NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This summary statement provides a summary of my Evidence In Chief ('EIC'), dated 20 April 2017, my Rebuttal Evidence, dated 15 June 2017, and includes updates to my evidence as a result of conferencing.

2 Correction to Evidence

- 2.1 In paragraph 13.49 of my EIC I provided a table assessing every property adjacent to SH18 between Constellation Drive and Rook Reserve. There was an error in the numbering of the properties in this table was incorrect, as follows:
- a Near the end of the table (page 43), reference is made to 47 Barbados Drive being 10m to Paul Matthews Road and 5m to SUP. This table entry should refer to 49 Barbados Drive, as 47 is a front section that will have views screened by number 49. This can be seen on the map on Page 3 of Annexure C to my EIC, and the cross section on Page 11. The degree of effect (moderate) remains the same.
 - b In the next row, 49 Barbados Drive should be removed and this row should refer only to 51 and 57 Barbados Drive.
 - c This error was also transposed into my conclusions, paragraphs 13.60c and 16.2c, where both should read 49 as experiencing moderate effects, not 47.

47 49 Barbados Drive	10m to Paul Matthews Road 5m to SUP	Paul Matthews Road and SUP up to 4m higher	Existing vegetation may need removal. New 2.4m fence. Enhancement planting possible on boundary.	Moderate
49, 51 and 57 Barbados Drive	Over 10m to Paul Matthews Road 5m to SUP	Paul Matthews Road and SUP up to 4m higher	Existing vegetation and new 2.4m fence. Large area for enhancement planting on boundary	Low

2.2 I confirm that I have rechecked all other properties in my analysis and that they remain correct.

3 Summary of evidence in chief¹

3.1 I have undertaken a detailed assessment of the proposed urban design outcomes, and the potential landscape and visual effects of the Project. In undertaking this assessment, I have visited the site on several occasions, worked with the Project Team to review the design and make changes to it, and have undertaken a detailed review of the UDLF.

3.2 I am of the opinion that, through the UDLF, the Urban Design Landscape Plans ('**UDLPs**') and the conditions of consent, the Project will provide good urban design outcomes. Principally this results from greater connectivity across this part of the city, its connections to the region, and the improved cross-connectivity over the existing road corridors. Detailed design principles and outcomes sought are provided for in the UDLF, and I consider that the conditions and design process will allow for sufficient ongoing review by both the Project Team and key stakeholders (such as Auckland Council).

¹ EIC, section 5.

- 3.3 From a landscape perspective, I also consider that the Project will deliver positive outcomes. I accept that it will result in a change to parts of the landscape, particularly when existing vegetation is removed, but I am of the opinion that the extensive proposed planting more than mitigates for this loss, indeed it will provide an enhancement. The road corridor will have improved landscape amenity, lower whole of life costs, and contribute to wider landscape outcomes (such as wildlife corridors). These outcomes are driven through the UDLF, which is required to be implemented through various conditions proposed.
- 3.4 Generally, the potential visual effects across the Project will be low, rising to moderate in Character Area D (as assessed in the LVE Report). However, from the detailed assessment of the Project, I consider that there are some properties that will experience higher levels of visual effects, as follows:
- a The western-most residences at 60B Masons Road that overlook the proposed Albany Busway Overbridge. It is recommended that lower height lighting be used on this bridge.
 - b Four properties in Colliston Rise (Lots 25, 26, 27 and 28) directly adjacent to retaining walls. Mitigation options are set out in the UDLF.²
 - c Four properties in Barbados Drive (numbers 39, 41B, 43 and 45) directly adjacent to the proposed Paul Matthews Road overbridge, and a further four properties (numbers 33, 35, 37 and 49 – noting this is now the correct numbering) who will experience moderate effects. Mitigation options include a new 2.4m fence extending the length of the boundary from Caribbean Drive to Rook Reserve, and the retention and enhancement of boundary planting.
- 3.5 The mitigation of these potential visual effects is also driven by design principles and outcomes sought in the UDLF, and the proposed mitigation will be reviewed by Auckland Council during the outline plan process.

² Section 5.7 of the revised UDLF, page 38 (Annexure A of my EIC).

3.6 Overall, I consider that the Project has positive urban design outcomes, positive landscape effects, and low to moderate visual effects, although there are some properties adjacent to the Project that will experience higher effects.

4 Summary of rebuttal evidence

4.1 In my rebuttal evidence, I addressed matters raised in the evidence of various submitters.³

4.2 As noted in my rebuttal,⁴ I appreciate many of the concerns raised by the submitters in their submissions and evidence. Where possible, I have worked with the Project Team to incorporate changes that can be made in response to these concerns, or provide appropriate, useful additional information where this has been required.

4.3 Whilst I agree, from an urban design perspective, that increasing connectivity along and across SH1 and SH18 is a desired outcome, there is only so much that any single project can deliver. In my opinion, the Project contributes to enhancement of pedestrian and cycling movement in the wider area, and importantly does not reduce it. In addition, the Project does not preclude additional development (such as a SUP on the south side of SH18) in the future, but rather secures opportunities that are currently available.

4.4 I also reiterate that the proposed planting across the Project area will bring significant benefits in terms of both landscape outcomes and visual mitigation. However, the downside of planting is that it will screen views to some properties. Where possible, I have ensured that planting is kept low to allow such visibility, but this has to be balanced against the other benefits, and the fact that planting is a permitted, and desirable, outcome.

4.5 Overall, I remain of the opinion that the Project has positive urban design outcomes, positive landscape effects, and low to moderate visual effects overall. I acknowledge that there remain some properties that will

³ Andrew Fraser and Howard Trautvetter, Sam Allan and Geoff Land on behalf of Kiwi Self Storage Limited; Ian Kennedy and Andrea Brabant on behalf of Waste Management NZ Ltd; Peter Fogarty; Stephen Brown, Joanna Hart and Maylene Barrett on behalf of Auckland Council.

⁴ Rebuttal evidence, section 7.

experience higher effects, but in my opinion these effects can either be mitigated, or are acceptable outcomes within the context of the Project.

5 Results of conferencing

- 5.1 I took part in the expert conferencing session on landscape, urban design and visual impacts on 19 June 2017. I note that Mr Brown, for Auckland Council, and I largely agreed on the level of effects of the Project. Our core difference related urban design outcomes, this being the location of the SUP along SH18, a matter that Auckland Council no longer wishes to pursue. Mr Brown also seeks an upgrade to the Alexander Creek underpass (not part of the Project), and a connection to Rook Reserve from Paul Matthews Drive (not part of the Project and also outside the scope of the Project).
- 5.2 In regard to paragraph 5(l).e of the JWS: Landscape, Urban Design and Visual, I note that the current verge on the southbound side of SH1, adjacent and north of Kiwi Self Storage is currently between 15 and 25 metres (approximately) wide and currently contains a single row of palm trees, some specimen ngaio trees, and grass. This minimal landscape treatment results in relatively high ongoing maintenance costs in comparison to other treatments such as planting (especially being sloped with difficult access). It is highly plausible, in my opinion, that, in time, the Transport Agency would seek to plant this verge with native vegetation (irrespective of the Northern Corridor Improvements project) – similar as has been undertaken elsewhere in the motorway network, and in accordance with the Transport Agency Landscape Guidelines⁵ – in an effort to reduce whole of life costs. It is my understanding that such planting is permitted under the designation and the underlying zoning, and it is my opinion that such planting would significantly screen any views to neighbouring properties (including Kiwi Self Storage), as has been experienced elsewhere across the network. In my opinion, the planting that has been undertaken across the motorway network in recent years has resulted in positive landscape outcomes, and is to be encouraged.

⁵ NZ Transport Agency 'Landscape Guidelines' Final Draft, September 2014. Page 38.

Update to UDLF

- 5.3 The JWS: Landscape, Urban Design and Visual, dated 19 June 2017, records that I will make the following changes to the UDLF as a result of conferencing:
- a Section 5.1, page 30 – Addition of 'Kiwi Self Storage' under bullet point 9 (regarding visibility to existing commercial and industrial landholdings).
 - b Section 6, Page 45 – Addition of note adjacent to Rosedale Landfill stating 'Allow space for an at-grade future SUP connection to Rosedale Landfill between busway CH2100 and CH2200'.
 - c Section 6, Page 47 – Addition of note adjacent to Rosedale Wastewater Treatment Ponds stating 'Allow space for an at-grade future SUP connection to Open Space between busway CH3500 and CH3700.'
 - d Section 6, Page 57 and 58 – Alter note regarding low planting to include 'e.g. Mountain Flax'.
 - e Section 6, Page 48 – Alter note regarding retention of native vegetation to include 'between Constellation Interchange and Carribean Drive.'
 - f Section 6, Page 50 – Alter note regarding retention of native vegetation to include 'between Carribean Drive and Rook Reserve, except where affected by the construction of the Paul Matthews Drive overbridge.'
- 5.4 The JWS also records an agreed change to Section 6, Page 50 of the UDLF by adding a note to identify Jumento Place, and adding a note stating 'Allow connection to Barbados Drive opposite Jumento Place, if this walkway is reopened by others.' I understand that this issue has been the subject of additional discussions between Auckland Council and the Transport Agency regarding potential difficulties in terms of the feasibility of providing a connection during the detailed design phase. On the basis

of the outcome of those discussions, I intend to amend the proposed note to be added to the UDLF as follows:

Allow a connection to Barbados Drive opposite Jumento Place, if this walkway is reopened by Auckland Council, and if providing such a connection is feasible during the detailed design stage.

- 5.5 The JWS: Recreation and Reserves notes, at paragraph 5c, that a connection from Centorian Reserve and the SUP should not be precluded. I will add a note in the UDLF to this effect (Section 6 Page 47). The Recreation and Reserves experts also requested (paragraph 5j of the JWS), an amendment to the UDLF to ensure that the design of the SUP does not preclude connections from the SUP to Rosedale Landfill in the future, and notes will be added to this effect as outlined above.
- 5.6 These changes are in addition to those made to Section 6 as appended to my rebuttal evidence, which also contain further notes around the Waste Management and Rosedale Landfill sites.
- 5.7 Rather than providing an updated version of the UDLF at this point, I propose that the UDLF is updated following the appearance of the landscape, visual, and urban design experts at the hearing. This will enable further potential amendments to be incorporated, as may be recommended by the Board. I suggest that I provide a full new revision of the UDLF (Revision 3 with a new date), incorporating all the changes, with the closing submissions, or at an earlier point should this be required.

6 Updates

- 6.1 I have read the JWS prepared by the noise and vibration experts, and I understand that they have proposed a 2.4m high noise wall along the southern side of SH18, between Constellation Interchange and Caribbean Drive. I consider that from a visual effects perspective, such a wall will be generally beneficial. Whilst I have assessed the visual effects of the proposal as being low to very low for properties in this location, I have noted variations in the quality of existing fences.
- 6.2 The new noise wall will provide a clean boundary barrier that will significantly reduce views of the existing road infrastructure, as well as the proposal elements located further away. The wall would not affect the ability to undertake enhancement planting between the boundary and the SUP. Whilst it would be higher than a standard boundary fence (typically 1.8m), it is not so high as to be overly dominant or to create significant shading effects. I consider that the benefits, in terms of both visual and noise effects reductions, will outweigh any adverse effects that might be created by the wall itself.
- 6.3 The JWS: Reserves and Recreation records proposed changes by those experts to the Rook Reserve condition (designation condition UDL.6B) outlining various requirements for the reinstatement of Rook Reserve.
- 6.4 I led the development of a concept plan for Rook Reserve that has informed meetings between the Transport Agency and Auckland Council (Auckland Parks), and therefore have a good understanding of both the design objectives of each party, and the constraints of the site brought about by topography. I consider that the requirements set out in the condition offered by the Reserves and Recreation experts would be challenging, if not impossible, to deliver due to the slope of the site (and limited availability for flat areas). I also note that the basketball court was designed to double as a hard stand area for maintenance of the stormwater ponds.
- 6.5 The Planning experts did not incorporate all of the changes proposed by the Reserves and Recreation experts for this condition into the current set of conditions and I support the wording of the Rook Reserve conditions as

appended to the JWS: Planning (Annexure 3) for the reason outlined above. I consider the requirements as proposed by the Planning experts for the reinstatement of Rook Reserve are workable and reflect the original intention to use the stormwater pond maintenance area as a basketball court.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shannon Bray', written over a horizontal line.

Shannon Bray

23 July 2017