

Minutes of Meeting

Pt Chevalier Streetscape and Cycleway – Community Liaison Group Meeting 05

Date and time: Tuesday 27 November 2018, 12pm

Venue: Pt Chevalier Community Centre, 18 Huia Rd, Pt Chevalier

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Attendees: | Linda Wong | Community |
| | Darren Jarrett | Community |
| | Mark Johnson | Community |
| | Nic Rowan | Community |
| | Rick Thevenard | BISC |
| | Grant Russell | Western Springs Football Club |
| | Jolisa Gracewood | Bike Auckland |
| | Heidi O’Callahan | Pt Chev Placemaking |
| | Walter Dendi | Transition Pt Chevalier |
| | Jessica Rose | Albert-Eden Local Board |
| | Graeme Bean | Auckland Transport |
| | Himanshu Rawat | Auckland Transport |
| | Twan van Duivenbooden | Auckland Transport |
| | Alice Ge | Auckland Transport |
| | Paul Buckle | Auckland Transport |
| | Samantha Walton | CLG Support |

Start 12pm

1. Welcome and introductions – Graeme Bean

Apologies from Denise and Kane for absence.

2. Agenda and project update – Himanshu Rawat

Update on progress since last CLG. Met with Mana Whenua, Albert-Eden Local Board, AC Arborist, PCG meetings x2

Project update (PRESENTATION)

3. Meola Road options discussion

Trees

The project team explained recent investigations have revealed that the trees (sections 1 & 5) create a bigger constraint than originally thought and this has impacted the potential options for Meola Rd.

In order to provide a full width cycleway on some sections of Meola Rd (sections 1 & 5) trees would need to be removed on one side of the road. Mitigation planting may be possible, but it is uncertain how many new trees could be planted and where they would be located; they would take time to mature and their form would likely be different to the current specimens (they would need to be tall and thin).

If wholesale tree removal on one side of the road is unacceptable a safe and attractive uni-directional cycleway on both sides of the road (sections 1 & 5) would **NOT** be feasible.

It would be feasible to retain trees and provide a safe and attractive bi-directional cycleway with localised narrowing around the trees and some tree trimming to accommodate large vehicle clearance.

Outcome

CLG preference to retain trees on Meola Rd, provide a bi-directional cycleway on the northern side and accept localised narrowing of cycleway on sections 1 and 5. CLG acknowledged that this option would still require tree canopy trimming on the southern side to accommodate large vehicle clearance.

CLG rationale:

- Time it would take for new trees planted as mitigation to reach maturity
- Uncertainty on the number, size and location of any new trees that could be accommodated on the corridor
- Likelihood that new trees will be of a type/form (tall and thin) that would provide less shelter (eg. shade whilst walking) than current trees
- Expectation of major public backlash for mass tree removal. Trimming expected to be more acceptable.
- As the existing trees eventually die or need replacing (end of natural life, storm damage, disease, etc.), they can be replaced with other species (to be agreed) and the cycleway could be widened with relative ease at the localised narrowing points.

CLG discussion points on trees

- Discussion on natives vs exotics - Northern side are exotic trees; southern side some exotic, some native
- Concerns raised about what the trees drop re spiky/dangerous seeds – need to determine what species. Suggest removing exotic trees and replacing with natives, which do not drop spiky seeds. Suggest small natives to replace large exotic trees.
- Very important to keep large canopy trees, regardless of whether they are exotic or not, for environmental and urban effect.
- Query about lifespan of trees, and request for arborist report re lifespan, species and health.
- trees on southern side are trimmed a bit now to provide clearance for heavy vehicles
- If bi-directional cycleway with localised narrowing is preferred - trees on the south side will need to be significantly trimmed to accommodate large vehicle envelope.

- CLG expect a lot of backlash from public for mass tree removal but expect that trimming would have a lot less inflammatory effect. If public are very aware that arborist reports etc have been done and we know that the trimming will not kill the trees etc, it should be more readily accepted.
- It was noted that AT can trim trees as part of maintenance to keep the road corridor clear for heavy vehicles.
- The information about species, lifespan, health etc of trees could also be told as part of the story to reassure about the eventual undergrounding of services, e.g. the trees will be removed, but by then they will be old and dangerous anyway.
- Suggest discussing with botanical gardens and arborists for appropriate replacement planting.
- There are about 12 sections that would require localised narrowing to avoid trees, if the trees are very close together the narrowing would be continuous for those sections rather than weaving in and out.

Overhead power lines on southern side of Section 1

In order to provide a full width cycleway on section 1 of Meola Rd along with tree removal, relocation of power lines would also be required. If relocation of the power lines were to take place to accommodate the full width cycleway, CLG considered it should be undergrounded and not shifted laterally.

Project team from AT have discussed with Vector the possibility of coordinating undergrounding services with the streetscape upgrade project. Vector have confirmed they have no plans to underground services.

Outcome

From a project point of view the rationale for undergrounding services would be to provide a full width cycleway (sections 1 & 5). This would go hand in hand with tree removal on the southern side. CLG expressed a desire to keep the trees on both sides of the road and to not have wholesale removal of trees on south side. The CLG acknowledged trees would need to be trimmed to enable safe passage of heavy vehicles.

CLG considers that if Vector plans to underground the services, coordinating the works with the cycleway project would be the best outcome. As a result, CLG request that

- a. it goes on record that the community wants a co-ordinated approach between AT and Vector to underground services at the same time
- b. if Vector refuses, for them to confirm in writing that the request was made and declined, in case they decide otherwise later

CLG rationale

CLG recognises that AT cannot force Vector to underground services at the same time as project.

As CLG preference is to retain trees and accept localised narrowing (sections 1 & 5) CLG agrees that streetscape project should not have to fund undergrounding services.

CLG discussion points on undergrounding

- CLG view that it's not just a cycleway project, it is a full street redesign – a once in a generation change, so if anything is being undergrounded, it needs to happen all at once.
- CLG concerned that if project goes ahead without undergrounding services and then Vector decide to underground at a later date causing further disruption the CLG members will look bad.
- Community members recognise that there is pressure on Vector to underground services, but AT cannot make them – public pressure might help.
- If trees are retained (from the AT project perspective) there is no need to underground services. The rationale for undergrounding (from an AT project perspective) would be to provide space for cycleway but the CLG preference to retain the trees makes this a moot point.
- CLG agree that the AT streetscape project should not have to fund undergrounding services.
- CLG feel that Vector should be undergrounding services for the good of the street and the community, regardless of the cycleway. And in order to avoid causing major disruption to the community twice.
- If CLG insist on making undergrounding happen with the cycleway project, it may cause delays to the project and cost a significant amount more, which may make the project less feasible when weighed against other priorities.
- There have been some successes (i.e. Franklin Road) and some failures (i.e. Gladstone Rd) in getting Vector to agree to underground services.

Parking

There was some general discussion on the parking impacts on Meola Road.

Project team confirmed that none of the options retain parking on sections 1, 2, 4 & 5. The only section where on street parking could be accommodated would be on section 3.

Outcome

There was no clear outcome from the meeting in relation to parking. CLG agreed that there was a need to get the message right to explain the parking removal, especially considering how much perceived and peak demand there is in the area.

CLG recognise that only a limited amount of parking can be accommodated on Meola Rd compared to what is currently in place.

There was some disagreement among the CLG members on what type of mitigation was necessary. Some advocated for better parking management approach, others preferred the creation of a new off-street car park on MOTAT.

CLG discussion points on parking

- There is no way around parking removal – it will always be a tough one to get various parties to agree on. The community are unlikely to be happy if the project just removes all parks and does not provide any mitigation for this, but the community is in favour of removal of parking on Meola Road.

- It feels like the leaflet gone out to the community is ‘paying lip service’ and gliding over the parking issues and removal.
- There needs to be a carpark area behind the football club.
- Discussion on the Western Springs area wide parking strategy / plan. The parking management plan is owned by the Western Springs Stakeholder Group, AT co-funded it.
- Unless you take a precinct-wide approach to parking management, you will get perverse outcomes.
- The parking surveys are flawed because the parking is not charged, and other modes are not catered to. Once there are facilities provided, the demand changes.
- Half of all people to the football club are from out of the area (2,500 people). AT need to come up with a travel plan for these people.
- Should not be all on the football club to accommodate/arrange for these people. We must look after anyone, not just cycleways.
- Because parking is free, unrestricted parking, there is no management, so people are encouraged to drive.
- It’s not just about the number of parking spaces, it’s how you manage them. The right approach is to consider how much the road can accommodate and managing it from there.
- Perhaps could the existing carpark areas be charged now and see how the parking behaviour changes (e.g. TAPAC carpark). What can AT do now to address this issue? TAPAC carpark is not AT-owned so they are unable to make the decision to make it paid.
- Is AT legally obliged to provide parking? There is no legal obligation for AT to provide parking. It is not AT’s legal responsibility to provide parking for the football fields or events.
- There needs to be alternative parking and transport. Removing the parking on Meola Road is likely to improve bus route times and make this a much more viable option.
- Suggest plantings to prevent people parking on the berms / over kerbs.

Traffic calming on bird streets and connections to Pt Chevalier School

Jessica confirmed the Local Board are considering funding traffic calming on the bird streets and a connection to Pt Chevalier School as part of their Local Board Transport Capex fund. These projects will be assessed against other Local Board funding priorities. It is a separate process from this project. Need community consultation to make that happen – physical changes vs legislative changes – may be able to change speed limit quite quickly with community petition/support.

Outcome

CLG acknowledges that these projects will be progressed separately from the AT project. The aim will be to coordinate but they are separate funding processes.

CLG discussion points on bird street traffic calming and connection to Pt Chevalier school

- The work in coordination with the Boards and Council (re connection to the schools and traffic calming in bird streets) need to be shared with the public better, with more detailed information on what will be happening in these projects.
- It is great that the Local Board is coming to the table and helping, and the community is happy to work with them for this but AT needs to source more funding from other projects

that are creating the traffic in the first place. Discussion about AT funding priority (cycling get 2% instead of the 20% of funding it should).

Other

CLG need to meet more often and the dates for the meetings need to be set more than a week in advance to allow rearrangement of schedules if required.

The next stage of design will have a better idea of where the crossings will be and where the safety mitigations will be.

The URL links need to be checked to ensure ability to share on social media (issues experienced)

Re disability/wheelchair access: all projects are discussed with accessibility/disability groups, and this project will be doing the same later down the track when design is being determined.

Actions resulting

- Need more information about the Western Springs Parking Management Plan; Zoo parking; TAPAC parking. **Project team to re-engage with Western Springs Stakeholder Group**
- CLG request for newsletter to come through the CLG before going out to the public, as it is representative for their voice, fliers need to be clearer and less lip service – - **To be discussed with comms team**
- CLG request for arborist report – species, lifespan, health of trees – **Himanshu to forward**
- CLG meeting dates need to be in advance more than one week.