

Before the Hearing Commissioner appointed by Napier City Council

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991
(the Act)

And in the matter of an application by The Te Awa Land
Development Company Limited to
establish a comprehensive suburban
commercial development at 35 Kenny
Road, Napier

Statement of evidence of Aaron Campion

29 October 2019

Sainsbury Logan & Williams
Solicitors
Cnr Tennyson Street & Cathedral Lane
Napier
PO Box 41
Phone: 06 835 3069
Fax: 06 835 6746
Ref: Lara Blomfield
LJB-136562-4

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and experience

- 1 My full name is Aaron Campion.
- 2 I am a Technical Director of Urban Connection Limited, which was established in May 2018. Prior to this I held the role of Service Group Manager and was the National Service Line Leader for GHD's National Transportation Planning and Traffic Engineering discipline. I hold a Post Graduate Diploma in Transportation Engineering from Canterbury University and a Higher National Diploma in Civil Engineering from Anglia Ruskin University. I am certified as a Highway Development Control Professional by the Institute of Highway Engineers in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Member of Engineering New Zealand and a member of the IPENZ Transportation Group.
- 3 My work experience includes over 16 years in transport planning, traffic engineering and road safety, working both in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.
- 4 A large portion of my career and related experience has centred on analysing the transport effects of land development proposals as well as developing and managing the implementation of development related infrastructure.
- 5 During this time, I have been responsible for reviewing a wide range of transport projects and developments, both for transport agencies and developers, including presenting evidence to Council Hearings for a variety of developers and on behalf of the Council. Examples include commercial, residential, industrial and mining developments.
- 6 I have also presented at the Coroners Court and performed the role of independent peer review on a range of transportation planning projects and developments.

Expert witness Code of Conduct

- 7 I have been provided with a copy of the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court's Practice Note dated 1 December 2014. I have read and agreed to comply with that Code. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying upon the specified evidence of another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 8 In April 2019 I undertook an assessment of the level of traffic that was likely to be generated by the proposed commercial development and the likely effect that this would have on the surrounding network. My assessment also included an assessment of road safety issues and the ability of the site to accommodate the overall access demands, including car parking.
- 9 My original assessment underwent peer review. This peer review was completed on 9 September 2019. In response to the peer review, I prepared an addendum dated 8th October which addressed the matters raised.
- 10 The purpose of this evidence is to confirm my assessment in respect of the transportation effects arising from the proposal and address transport matters raised in the submissions received to date.

TECHNICAL REPORT – SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

- 11 My report '35 Kenny Road, Napier, Traffic Impact Assessment' dated April 2019 is at Appendix D of the Section 42A Report.
- 12 My addendum addressing the clarifications raised in the peer review, dated 8 October 2019 is at Appendix K of the Section 42A Report.
- 13 I conclude that the proposed development can be accommodated within the local traffic and transportation environment with no more than minor effects. This conclusion is based on the assessment that the development is predicted

to generate up to 1,756 vehicles per day with a peak hour volume of up to 298 vehicles per hour.

- 14 While the peak hour traffic flows at the site are likely to coincide with the surrounding network peak, the expected effects from this traffic on the surrounding intersections have been assessed as no more than minor, and traffic effects beyond these intersections have been assessed as negligible.
- 15 The technical assessment underwent peer review and was deemed to be robust upon conclusion of the peer review process. There are no matters in dispute between the peer reviewer and I, as confirmed in Appendix K.
- 16 Notwithstanding, some minor improvements are proposed to improve connectivity and overall integration between the development and the surrounding network. These were set out within Section 9 of the Traffic Assessment (Appendix D of Council's section 42A report) and subsequently recommended by the Council's Planning Officer in Section 9.4, Conditions 1 – 3, Page 14 & 15.

RESPONSE TO MATTERS RAISED IN THE SECTION 42A REPORT

- 17 I have reviewed the Council's section 42A report issued on Thursday 17th October 2019. Matters relating to Transportation are addressed primarily under Section 9.4, Page 14. The Council's reporting planner and Council's transportation engineer accept as appropriate the conclusions of my technical report.

RESPONSE TO MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

- 18 The following matters have been raised by submitters which relate to my area of expertise:
 - 18.1 The provision of safe and efficient pedestrian connectivity between Summerset retirement village and the proposed commercial development.
 - 18.2 Increase in traffic volumes on both Kenny Road and Eriksen Road.

- 18.3 Inadequate provision of on-site car parking
- 18.4 Safety of the Kenny Road / Eriksen Road Intersection and in particular the ability for the proposed roundabout to address the existing safety concerns.
- 19 It is agreed that sufficient provision is required to safely support pedestrian movements both between the retirement village and the development as well as the wider residential area. The existing road network is identified as being upgraded to reflect a typical urban streetscape as part of the structure plan. This will include dedicated footpaths and crossing provision. In regard to specific crossing provisions at the development, best practice is to incorporate suitably designed crossing provisions at intersecting roads, as this best reflects pedestrian desire lines and common lines of travel. It was discussed with Napier City Council's transportation team that the crossing facilities will be provided on all legs of the proposed roundabout upgrade, as is best practice on an urban roundabout.
- 20 It is agreed that the existing layout of the Kenny Road, Eriksen Road Intersection performs poorly from a road safety perspective. This was not accurately reflected in the original safety assessment, with incorrect crash history being applied. The safety performance has since been confirmed through the detailed risk assessment carried out within the addendum, demonstrating that this intersection performs disproportionately to the level of traffic using it and is rated as 'High Personal Risk'.
- 21 My assessment determined that the predominant crash risk dominating the intersection safety performance was high speed, high angle impacts which presented the greatest risk of high severity trauma. The layout of the intersection and the crash trends indicated that drivers on Eriksen Road were failing to recognise the intersection and proceeding straight through, impacting with vehicles travelling along Kenny Road. The proposed roundabout is the best form of intersection at this location for three primary reasons.

- 21.1 The first being the physical change in the appearance and legibility of the intersection, presenting a direct layout change and restricting the existing unhindered longitudinal line of sight. This significantly reduces the likelihood of a driver failing to recognise the presence of the intersection.
- 21.2 The second and most significant factor is the forced reduction in speed and corresponding reduction in potential crash force energy, being the primary determinant in injury levels sustained.
- 21.3 The third, being the removal of the 90-degree high angle impact, which again reduces the crash force energy and also reduces the likelihood of impacting a vehicle directly side on where very little occupant protection is provided.

For these reasons, I am of the opinion that this intersection treatment is an appropriate and very effective safety treatment to address the existing safety concerns at this intersection.

- 22 One other concern submitters have raised about traffic is the noise effects associated with acceleration and deceleration of vehicles. That is not within my area of expertise but I understand noise associated with increases in traffic and acceleration, deceleration been specifically addressed in evidence provided by the Applicant's Acoustics Engineer, Daniel Martens.
- 23 Nevertheless, substantial increases in traffic along both Kenny Road and Eriksen Road are anticipated as a result of the Te Awa Structure Plan. The intersection of Kenny Road and Eriksen Road was identified as a roundabout within the structure plan, reflecting the levels of anticipated traffic and as such would have dictated similar levels of deceleration and acceleration of vehicles when negotiating the roundabout. Kenny Road in particular provides the only direct East / West link through the Te Awa Structure Plan, indicating the dominance this link would have for supporting traffic movements. Based on the levels of traffic using the intersection under the structure plan, I do not consider the traffic using Kenny Road or Eriksen Road to be vastly different as a result of this proposal to that originally

anticipated. Although not specifically calculated in both instances, they would be of a similar order of scale and both present a substantial increase over the current levels of traffic experienced on Kenny Road and Eriksen Road.

- 24 With regard to car parking, there were not errors in calculations when determining the level of appropriate car parking provision as suggested in the submission of Gareth and Joanne Jones, however I can understand how this may have occurred. It was in fact a purposefully designed reduction in provision to reflect several factors that were pertinent to the site. The factors were discussed with submitters at the pre hearing, and take into account the level of linked trips experienced at a suburban commercial development of this nature, the proximity of the residential community the development is intended to directly serve, the nature of the on-site uses and the requirement for short stay parking which results in high car parking turnover. The level of car parking provision has been a specific aspect addressed through the peer review process and deemed to be appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 25 Accordingly, it is concluded that the traffic associated with the proposed development is able to be accommodated on the adjacent road network and can be safely supported from a transportation perspective.
- 26 The transportation conditions set out within the Section 42A report (Section 9.4, Condition 1, 2 and 3) reflect the original recommendations made and are considered appropriate to support the proposal.

Aaron Campion

29 October 2019