Agenda

Auckland Transport
An Auckland Council Organisation

Working group discussion - Mission Bay safety improvements (2)

Date: 2 July 2019
Time: 13.00 – 15.00
Venue: Function room at Good George 71 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay (upstairs from Portofino)
Invitees:
Andrew Allen EGM Service Delivery
Andrew Garratt Principal T. Eng.
[redacted] Bus. Association
Kit Parkinson Orakei Local Board
Amanda Miller AT (minutes)
Randhir Karma GM Network Management
[redacted] Residents Association
[redacted] Bus. Association
Councillor Desley Simpson

Item	Topic	Responsible
1.	Discussion and agreement - 15 May 2019 minutes and feedback (attachment 1)	AA I All
2.	Discussion and agreement – Professional Services Brief for investigation of work (attachment 2)	All
3.	Update on Consultation feedback	Andrew Garratt / All
4.	Any other business - Orakei Local Board youth representation group request (attachment 3)	All
Next Meeting - tbc		

Feedback for discussion

Working Group Meeting - Mission Bay Safety Improvement (2)

Minutes dated 15 May 2019

Received from [redacted] (Mission Bay Business Association)

1.1 Concerns raised.

During the meeting you acknowledged that there were significant shortcomings in the consultation process undertaken by Auckland transport in relation to the proposed safety programme for Mission Bay. The most significant of these shortcomings was the failure to advise the community that the proposed changes were driven from an assessment of the area under the Safe Systems Assessment Framework without any explanation or background to the framework.

2 Terms of reference and proposed action plan

Also add at the end of section 2.3 Speed limit bylaws (which puts it under Terms of Reference and Consultation Feedback):

Attendees wanted to see both the feedback from the public submissions and substantiated evidence to support how and why Mission Bay has been rated High Risk BEFORE any decision is considered and made by AT to change any Speed Limits Bylaw.

This is also directly related to further discussion and outcomes on recommended or necessary Safety Improvements.

The minutes should also record that there was some discussion regarding the conflicting situation with respect to the possible release of the speed reviews for some parts of Auckland before the Mission Bay Safety Review is complete.

3.1 Vision Zero – rational for change / mandate from Central Govt.

On reading the minutes you are left with the impression that all of those in attendance at the meeting were in agreement that the Safe Systems Assessment Framework is the appropriate basis for reviewing the roading environment in the area. In fact there was a significant amount of scepticism at the meeting about the appropriateness of that basis for review and this should be recorded in the minutes.

Feedback from [redacted] (Mission Bay Residents Association)

1.1 Concerns raised.

Please add a reference to your own statement that AT has accepted that they got the presentation of the plans to the public wrong. That point was made very clearly in the meeting, but when the Herald checked with your CEO, he basically denied that. Personally, I thought the statement from the meeting painted AT in a good light, showing that you were responding positively to criticism.

2 Terms of reference and proposed action plan

A clarification on 2.3. No one asked for Mission Bay to be completely excluded from the Speed Limits Bylaw. We merely pointed out that making a final determination that Mission Bay would be subject to that while the data was being revisited and community consultation was ongoing would seem to undermine that consultation. For that reason we suggested Mission Bay's inclusion be subject to the confirmation from this group that the evidence supported it.

Attachment 2
2 July 2019

Feedback for discussion

Working Group Meeting - Mission Bay Safety Improvement

DRAFT Professional Services Brief for investigation of work

[redacted] – Mission Bay Business Association

1. Following on from our email below, our attention has been drawn to information obtained by NZ Herald from NZTA regarding their assessed safe and appropriate speeds around the country. We note in particular that the assessed safe and appropriate speed for Tamaki Drive in Mission Bay is 50 km an hour. We consider that the terms of reference should be amended to include reference to this information as part of the basis for decision-making.
2. We are concerned that the circulated draft of this document requires the independent consultant to adopt a significant number of assessment tools and guidelines which are preferred by Auckland Transport, when the local community would like to have some independent review as to whether or not those tools and guidelines are appropriate.
3. As a Business Association we are concerned that Auckland Transport are not looking at all transport modes equally and believe it should. The background to the brief should therefore include some reference to the fact that Tamaki Drive is an arterial route, which is important for residents not only accessing the village centres and beaches, but also for those inside and outside the ward travelling to and from the city.
4. It should also refer to the increasing amount of public transport using Tamaki Drive and some reference to the ideal road conditions for large buses including future proofing for double deckers. Our belief is that including multiple speed humps/raised crossings will slow public transport and we want the report to reference facts re this.
5. The background should also note that there has been a history of congestion on Tamaki Drive when engineering interventions are not set correctly. In this regard we are mindful of significant congestion (and some say crashes) caused by existing pedestrian crossings on busy weekends and the history of major congestion at the Patteson Avenue pedestrian crossings prior to them being signalised. In fact as mentioned at the meeting, this is why this intersection was signalised.
6. There is also a risk that the services brief as it is currently drafted, will direct the independent consultant to identify safety risks for which Auckland Transport have already designed the solutions.
7. Having had a few days to think about it we now realise that the crash analysis of Mission Bay area over the last few years confirms that Vision Zero has already been achieved in Mission Bay. There have been no deaths on the roads in the area over the last five year review period from 2013-2017.
8. The only serious injury was in fact late at night and due to poor lighting which none of the proposed changes would alleviate.
9. During busy times the traffic speed in Mission Bay is significantly lower than the posted speed limit and we understand this has been borne out in recent surveys. In fact the average speed in both directions on Tamaki Drive and the number of vehicle movements, as advised by AT, have both reduced over the same five year review period.

10. Having regard to these factors we consider that the scope of work required should be amended to give the independent consultant scope to utilise the best method, in their professional opinion, for reviewing the safety aspects of the Roading network in Mission Bay.
11. If the independent consultant's professional view were that the Safe Systems Assessment Framework is the best tool for reviewing the safety aspects of Mission Bay, then they should have the scope to carry out their own assessment rather than relying on Auckland Transport's assessment. The Safe System score provided by AT doesn't mean much without knowing how it was arrived at.
12. The scope should also be amended to require that the consultant identify specific issues that need to be addressed, along with the engineering intervention that they recommend to resolve that issue. A consultant was appoint to address the safety issues within Mission Bay.

[redacted] Mission Bay Residents Association

We are a bit disappointed with the Brief, which is heavy on background and light on scope of work, and the background strongly guides the consultant towards predetermined outcomes such as 30km/hr speed restrictions and engineering improvements. Our detailed comments are below:

1. The purpose of the contract as we understand it is to identify any excessively high risk elements in the existing roading network. It would then be up to the working group to determine whether any of these met the threshold for requiring engineering or other improvements, and if so, what these improvements might be. The brief as proposed requires the consultant to decide whether engineering treatments are required. We believe the consultant should simply be required to identify those elements with the highest risk of serious harm.
2. Further, the brief requires this decision to be made on the basis of achieving "'Vision Zero' or a 'transport network free from harm'". We can tell you right now that to achieve a network free from harm, engineering treatments would be required on every road in Auckland, and vehicles would have to be banned. This is clearly impractical for many reasons, not least the finite budget available. Surely the issue is a matter of determining relative risk so that those engineering interventions that can achieve the most are undertaken first?

   Given that Mission Bay has had no fatalities and just 1 serious harm injury which could have been avoided by the interventions proposed in the past five years, it seems unlikely that Mission Bay would feature high up the priority list for Auckland. Despite this, it is likely that some engineering interventions would make sense and lower the risk of injury, and we are looking to the consultant to identify the highest risk areas.
3. The background provided to the scope of work tends to guide the consultant towards a 30km/hr speed limit. We acknowledge the phrase 'where the evidence supports it', but the overall tone suggests that this is what will happen, and that the consultant needs to evaluate risks with this in mind. The 30km/hr limit is a decision which has not yet been made and so it is inappropriate to take this approach. Our understanding is that NZTA's MegaMaps tool indicates that the appropriate speed for Mission Bay would be 50km/hr. If so, then engineering interventions to reduce speed would not be required as the evidence suggests that traffic flows at speeds lower than this already.

   We suggest this be rewritten. There should be no references to 30km/hr, just an appropriate speed. There should be no references to proposed improvements, as this

implies improvements are required, which we will not know until after the consultant has reviewed the data.

4. We object strongly to the statement that 'The road environment would be changed from one that could be perceived as being a high speed through-route, to one where people of all ages and abilities feel safe crossing the road'. It is clearly inappropriate to tell the consultant that Mission Bay roads are viewed as 'high speed through routes' as a starting point for their review of the data. Their job is to review the data, including current speed data, and come to conclusions about how the roads are used and what the risks are. The data may well suggest that Tamaki Drive is currently viewed as a slow speed through-route, and other roads as very slow residential connectors, and so trying to prime the consultant to start from an assumption that these are 'high speed through-routes' is poor practice.
5. We note the 3 goals of the Speed Management project. These goals completely ignore the undeniable fact that Tamaki Drive is the major commuter road for the eastern suburbs. Consideration must be given to this function as well as improving safety and connectivity and following an NZTA rulebook. This is not relevant to the consultant's work, but if it is worth providing the 3 goals as background, then surely it is worth also having a goal of improving commuter experience.

From: Hayley King <Hayley.King@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 1 July 2019 10:12 a.m.
To: Lorna Stewart (AT) <Lorna.Stewart@at.govt.nz>; Bruce Thomas (AT) <Bruce.Thomas@at.govt.nz>; Maureen Koch <Maureen.Koch@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Lucia Davis <Lucia.Davis@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Suzanne Weld <Suzanne.Weld@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Adam Milina <Adam.Milina@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Youth Representation on Mission Bay and St Heliers Safety Improvement Working Parties

Hi Both,

Can you please provide a response from AT for Maureen to reply to [redacted] on behalf of the local board?

From: RES Local Board Orakei
Sent: Friday, 28 June 2019 4:40 PM
To: Lucia Davis <Lucia.Davis@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Suzanne Weld <Suzanne.Weld@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>; Hayley King <Hayley.King@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Youth Representation on Mission Bay and St Heliers Safety Improvement Working Parties

Hi Lucia

Forwarding the email below from [redacted], who attended the Amplify event today.

Kind regards
Maureen

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 28 June 2019 2:19 PM
To: RES Local Board Orakei <OrakeiLocalBoard@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Subject: Youth Representation on Mission Bay and St Heliers Safety Improvement Working Parties

28 June 2019

To whom it may concern,

I recently attended the Amplify youth workshop organised by the Orakei Local Board. This was a great opportunity to hear the views held by the youth of this community, including myself. Hopefully as a result of this event, in the future, a greater youth voice will be heard and considered on various community issues.

Unfortunately, there is a lack of youth representation on present issues in the community. One specific issue that many youth hold a strong view on is the recently proposed AT Safety Improvements at St Heliers and Mission Bay. A youth perspective is not present in the discussions surrounding these proposals and is particularly lacking on the working parties which have been set-up to discuss these.

I strongly believe that this is a matter of significant importance to the youth in our community who use the footpaths and roads, whether that be through walking, scootering, biking, using the bus, or driving. This significant segment of the community is not being considered by the community

throughout the discussion of these changes and thus the outcome of the project will not be fit for purpose in meeting our needs.

I would like to see a member of the youth community present on both these working parties to ensure our views and ideas are being considered in a formal context. This is a great opportunity to start listening to youth matters and views in our community.

I would like to put myself forward for this, as I have put my name forward to be part of the new Orakei Local Board youth representation group and I have been following this matter with a deep interest. Should I have a role in the youth representation group, I will be able to utilise this to ensure the message of our group, representing the youth of our community, is heard and feedback is exchanged. However, because the youth committee is not being established until the end of next month and these working parties are addressing an immediate, ongoing issue, there needs to be some immediate steps taken to include youth representation on these groups.

I trust my concerns and suggestions are considered by the board and appropriate action is taken to ensure there is some youth representation on the Mission Bay and St Heliers working parties and to ensure our issues and considerations are being heard in the community.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.