

UNDER the Resource Management Act, 1991 and

IN THE MATTER of an application by Jeffrey Joy to establish an Oral Health Centre in a new two-level building on 63 and 65 Maunu Road Whangarei, with associated carparking and access from Maunu Road and North Street.

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DEAN R SCANLEN (TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER)

Introduction

1. My name is Dean Scanlen and I am a consultant transportation and Environmental engineer and the owner and Principal of the firm *Engineering Outcomes Ltd.* I hold a Bachelor of Engineering degree with first class honours from Auckland University, which I obtained in 1985. I have been working full time in the civil and traffic engineering field ever since. I am a Chartered Professional Engineer and am on the International Professional Engineers Register. I am also a member of the IPENZ Transportation Group and Sustainability Society, Engineers for Social Responsibility and the Cycling Advocate's Network.
2. I have previously been employed as a consultant for a Government department and for two private civil engineering consultancy firms. I have been self-employed for more than 21 years. During my career, I have provided advice to various clients in the public and private sectors on matters of transportation, roading and traffic management and environmental engineering. That work has covered planning, investigations, assessments of effects, resource consent applications, design and construction supervision.

3. I regularly give advice to clients on transportation planning and road traffic effects assessments including resource management assessment, transport economics, traffic conflict, safety, capacity, parking, off-road (“alternative”) transport and road upgrading. During my career, I have been involved with the planning, investigation, design and construction observation of numerous roading projects with values up to \$7 million as well as the roading and access associated with subdivision and development projects with values up to \$100 million.
4. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Environment Court of New Zealand). In that regard I confirm that this evidence is within my area of expertise, that I have considered all material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express and that I have qualified my opinions or conclusions wherever there is uncertainty in the basis for them
5. The proposal is fully described in the application and Council reporting officer’s (“s42A”) report and I refer the reader to both of those documents for details of the proposal.
6. My evidence is concerned with the traffic effects of the proposal. I have prepared both of the traffic effects assessment reports referred to in the s42A report and concluded that the effects of the traffic generation and parking demand associated with the proposal will be well within accepted limits. The parking also meets the limits specified in the *Whangarei District Plan* as a permitted activity. The effect on traffic and residents of North Street, will be less than minor, in fact, more than likely somewhere between not-noticeable and negligible.
7. I agree with all of the comments and conclusions of the s42A report that relate to traffic and parking effects and my reports. As such, I restrict this evidence to comments on submissions.

Submissions

8. A number of concerns are raised by submitters, but only two have not been directly addressed in my original assessment reports. My evidence is restricted to those two points, which are:
 - Visibility along Maunu Road from the North Street Intersection towards the northeast; and
 - Conflict between pedestrians and vehicles at the North Street crossing.
9. The proposal includes the removal of the existing fence along both the Maunu Road and North Street site frontage. This will actually improve the visibility from the North Street intersection towards the northeast, including for residents. As such, despite the additional traffic, the proposal will provide an overall betterment for exits from North Street.
10. I also note that the NZTA recently constructed the intersection and installed the fence, so obviously regards the existing visibility as acceptable.
11. There is no fence proposed along the North St boundary so, provided the landscape planting is restricted to low shrubs - less than ~1 metre high when fully grown, then there will be ample inter-visibility between pedestrians and car drivers. There is also no fence on the adjoining boundary to the immediate south of the site. On this basis, I consider the risk to pedestrians from the generated traffic as acceptable.
12. I also note that the North Street crossing replaces an existing double garage from which vehicles must reverse onto the road. That poses a much greater risk to pedestrians despite the lower existing level of traffic movement.

Dean Scanlen

BE (Civil) (Hons), CPEng, IntPE(NZ)

21 November 2017