

Minutes of Meeting

Subject: Waitemata Safe Routes: Old Mill Road, Surrey Cres, Garnet Road areas - Community Liaison Group Meeting 06

Date and time 5 September 2018, 3.15 – 4.45pm

Venue Auckland Transport, 20 Viaduct Harbour Road

Attendees	Ken Lee Jones	AT Manager
	David Wilkie	CLG Chair, Xigo
	Bruce Thomas	AT
	Julie Boucher	AT
	Emma O’Kane	Stellar Projects
	Hadi Basiri	AT
	Sandy Webb	AT Major Projects
	Irene King	Co-chair GLBA
	Rob Thomas	Waitemata Local Board
	Michael Hawes	Boffa Miskell
	Lisa Mein	Boffa Miskell
	Hanna O’Donoghue	Boffa Miskell
	Gael Baldock	Resident
	James Ellison	Beca
	Charles Joseph	Resident
	Chris de Lautour	Resident
	Lisa Prager	Business owner, Occupy Garnet
	Soala Wilson	Westmere Cres Working Group
	Carol Gunn	Western Springs College
	Barbara Cuthbert	Bike Auckland
	Mark Saunders	GLBA
	Richard Northey	Waitemata Local Board
	Louise Rive	Business Owner

Apologies	Carol Gunn (leaving early)	
	Jolisa Gracewood	Bike Auckland
	Wendy Grey	Occupy Movement
	Shay Ra	Resident
	Chris Conner	AT Project Manager

Copies to	David Nelson	AT
	Tarun Ahuja	AT

1. Welcome and Introductions – David Wilkie

David welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Ken Lee-Jones noted Joe Schady is no longer managing the project, the AT Project Manager is now Chris Connor, with Ken Lee-Jones as Manager.

Minutes of Meeting

David reminded everyone of the rules for fair meetings:

- Listen generously to others and consider their opinion – please don't interrupt others, have respect. David as the chair will manage the meeting.
- Respect the process – it is a process that is tried and proven. Address any comments through David as Chair.
- Avoid repetition. If someone has made your point, feel free to offer support and emphasis, but let's not spent time repeating.
- Address the issue and not the person. Avoid the emotion and stick to the issue.

Will be some presentations, please hold questions until after the presentations made

Discussion

Lisa raised concern about previous meeting and lack of opportunity to provide feedback.

- Will speed up presentations to provide as much time for discussion.
 - Will not go through minutes to save time.
 - Will run through entire presentations as many questions will be answered through these.

2. Matters arising – David Wilkie

Agreed not to be discussed.

Update on actions from previous minutes

Action	Status
1 Minutes and presentations to be circulated to attendees	Completed
2 CLG members to submit feedback on Boffa presentation within two weeks so that Boffa can take this on board	
3 Some further refinement of the Boffa work is required to show a plan view of the full length of roading with a few representative cross sections. This should include developing safe bike lanes	
4 The signalisation of Richmond and Surrey needs to be developed and be reported on at the next CLG	
5 Resend safety to audits to Gael	
6 Loop counts to be provided to CLG	
7 MR Cagney to present on bus stop locations and shelters	

3. Process update – Ken Lee-Jones, AT

Powerpoint presentation as circulated with minutes.

Lisa interrupted the meeting and was asked to comply with the meeting rules and invited to leave if she felt she would not be able to. Lisa was asked to hold her questions to the end of the presentation.

AT continued with the presentation

4. Project Update – Boffa Miskell

Powerpoint presentation as per handout provided in the meeting.

Lisa interrupted the meeting again and was again asked to hold her questions. Gael expressed dissatisfaction with the meeting process. Others in the meeting expressed concern with continued disruption.

Boffa Miskell continued with the presentation.

- Proposing a combination of on-line (within the traffic lane) and off-line bus stops
- Pedestrian crossing places are generally raised zebra crossings
- Proposed kerb separator between the cycleway and parking will be wide enough for bins
- Proposed additional street trees in village locations to define those.

Boffa Miskell suggested some questions that the group might like to focus on, but encouraged people to not limit themselves to the questions and provide feedback on any aspect of the aspirational design.

David reinforced that this is a first flush of the aspirational design which the CLG has an opportunity to provide comment on over the next three weeks. Then public engagement on a refined plan taking into account feedback from the CLG.

5. Questions

Regarding the section of Garnet Road near Warwick Ave intersection is there any parking?

- Yes, more detail is included in the back of the handout

Why are the bus stops outside the school on Surrey Cres being retained?

- Retained at the request of AT

Busses have been observed parking on Firth Street and reversing back around the corner which is very dangerous.

- Boffa Miskell have taken note of this and will consider.

Lisa considers that this plan is not changed from previous design suggested by AT prior to any previous engagement.

- Lisa was thanked for her feedback and reminded of the process we have gone through, which has started from first principles. She was encouraged to provide feedback on the design over the next three weeks.

Asking feedback by the 24th September is challenging as there is an existing consultation underway in the community about boundaries for the Waitemata Ward of Auckland Council. The community needs to get through this current engagement prior to the next one.

Businesses need multiple levels of input and no surprises. Would like the businesses to be really aligned and engaged in development of plans. Villages need really high quality parking as they are destination villages.

Suggested AT look at an extension of time to provide feedback, given existing engagement underway.

Minutes of Meeting

- Boffa Miskell made the offer to come and make presentations to smaller groups about the project and provide more opportunity for discussion.

AT will discuss within the project team the timing of feedback from the CLG which conflicts with the current ward boundary engagement.

Rob Thomas suggested that businesses need more 1:1 discussion regarding the proposal, and Boffa Miskell reiterated the offer to discuss the designs further with those who would like to meet.

Soala doesn't feel that the design has taken on board feedback. Also concerned that small group meetings are not effective. Lisa reiterated this.

- Comments acknowledged, and the group was reminded that community wide engagement would occur once the designs have been completed following CLG feedback.

Intersection of Richmond Road/Surrey would prefer a roundabout

- AT has considered this, however a roundabout is not preferred solution for various reasons. Further information will be provided during public engagement.

Traffic lights at the bottom of the Bullock Track have meant lot less cars on Richmond Road than previous so a roundabout might work now.

- AT can provide further information regarding the assessment of a roundabout undertaken by Beca.

How many carparks are there now and how many are proposed?

- Won't know exact numbers until a final detailed design has been developed.

Noting there is a budget shortfall, where is the rest going to come from or what is AT going to do to deliver anything?

- That's one of the key pieces of feedback AT us wanting from the – what are the priorities of the CLG members? The aspirational plan has a \$25-30M price tag. There is \$6M. CLG feedback will help AT prioritise what happens.

Lisa considers this is not about the funding, but not listening to the community. Lisa considers that AT has no mandate to change the road code which is what is proposed as part of the aspirational design.

- Noted

Noted that the information presented is 'for discussion only' – this is supported and we all want to continue to be engaged. As a small business owner would like to see services considered like drainage. Don't want the road dug up again to do work on other services.

All buildings pre-1935 have been requested by Council to get an engineering assessment. This all comes at a cost to business. They may not survive. There is going to be considerable change in the area over the next few years and AT need to be doing everything they can to support business.

Adopt a 'measure 6 times and cut once' approach to ensure all other aspects such as drainage have been adequately considered so it's right the first time.

- Noted

AT noted they are proposing in-line buses. Can Gael have a copy of the document that supports this?

- AT can circulate information about in-line bus stops

Gael requested the design framework which has been used to develop the aspirational design.

- AT cannot provide this as it's not yet approved. It will be published once approved.

Gael requested large A0 plans as in display in the meeting

- Not at this stage. AT will have a public consultation period where plans will be in a public place where everyone can see them and comment on them.
- Noted also that Boffa's have offered to attend 1:1 meetings and discuss the design on more detail

Lisa reinforced that small meetings are not considered to be effective and does not support the proposed public engagement process.

- Noted

Gael requested a copy of the Health and Safety report for both cycling and pedestrians. Some features of the aspiration design look to be dangerous.

- AT is not yet at the point for a health and safety review. Reference to the previous delay in being ready to have a CLG meeting for these reasons was related to consideration of driveway accesses.

If health and safety hasn't been considered, how can you propose a design?

- Design takes account of design standards

Lisa considers the design shows exactly what was previously proposed, which is exactly what Occupy Garnet doesn't want, and that the design does not reflect feedback from Occupy Garnet.

- Health and safety has been addressed and AT do not agree with Lisa's views on this.

Lisa does not support that 'do nothing' is an option. She does not believe there is a need to spend money. Does not believe traffic calming to slow traffic is effective. Believes marketing and advertising will be more effective. Considers previous feedback has been ignored.

- Noted. Lisa was invited to provide feedback during the 3-week CLG feedback period

How was the driveway access assessment undertaken – especially regarding sight lines around driveways and cycleways inside of parked cars?

- The assessment has been done for both drivers seeing cyclists from driveways and intersections; and cyclists being able to see vehicles.
- It included a safe stopping distance and sight lines assessment
- AT is also looking at a 20km speed environment for cyclists in cycle lanes to be reinforced through 'societal change' ie behaviour change via education

Cyclist visibility to moving traffic is blocked traffic by parked cars as they are on the inside of parked cars. Would it not be safer to have cycling on the outside of parked cars so they are more visible?

- Side road treatments like raised speed tables will reduce speed at intersections to slow vehicles and provide time for cyclists and cars to see each other.

What about visibility at all the driveways?

- The design has been considered in an international context, and considered appropriate.

Concerned with downhill cycle lanes and the ability to restrict cyclists to 20km/h

- Noted

Franklin Road has a different design which is great. Why can't we have that?

- For AT to consider further

Concerned that in-line bus stops are contrary to emission reduction as vehicles are stopped.

- AT can distribute further information regarding this.

Where can people view the international standard regarding cycle lanes on the inside of parked cars and do these standards change depending on road width? Would like to understand the design assumptions for design and what international standards are

- AT will get this information and circulate it.

Concern regarding driveways

- AT will provide analysis undertaken.

If the design standards being proposed are as per what is there now, then it is considered they don't work.

- Noted

Concerned with Ngapipi Road intersection and parts of extended Quay St cycleways – these are new pieces of infrastructure but there are significant safety issues with them. AT doesn't appear to be getting this right so concerned about what is proposed.

- Noted

The Surrey Cres / Richmond Road intersection current situation is dangerous and request a roundabout.

- As per previous, this was considered and it will not perform as required.

Lisa considers that lowering speed limits will not save lives. Promoting congestion seems to be supported by the Waitemata LB and Mayor.

- Noted that these issues raised are outside the scope of this project.
- Lisa disagreed and considers changes in other parts of the city have caused safety issues, so why would we accept that what is proposed here isn't going to have the same or similar safety issues

Lisa again disrupted the meeting and raised issues outside the scope of the CLG. It was suggested that Lisa raised her concerns with others in AT.

Irene would like to work out some cost effective solutions and would like to see information about a roundabout v traffic lights at Richmond/Surrey.

- AT will provide.

Attendees were reminded to provide feedback on the aspirational design to AT over the next three weeks as requested.

6. Next Steps

AT powerpoint presentation on next steps outlining the wider community engagement.

Minutes of Meeting

7. Any other business

Nil.

Actions

What	Who	When
1 Minutes to attendees	Bruce Thomas	20 September 2018
2 Provide information regarding a roundabout v signalised intersection at Richmond Rad/Surrey Cres intersection		
3 Provide information regarding the international standard for cycle lanes on the inside of parked cars		
4 Provide the driveway sight distance/ safety assessment		

Meeting closed 4.45pm.