



---

**PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL**

---

**AGENDA**

**INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

---

**9AM, WEDNESDAY 4 NOVEMBER 2020**  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH

---



---

## MEMBERSHIP

---

**Vaughan Dennison (Chairperson)**

**Susan Baty (Deputy Chairperson)**

**Grant Smith (The Mayor)**

**Brent Barrett**

**Rachel Bowen**

**Zulfiqar Butt**

**Lew Findlay QSM**

**Billy Meehan**

**Karen Naylor**

**Bruno Petrenas**

**Aleisha Rutherford**

**Agenda items, if not attached, can be viewed at:**

**pncc.govt.nz | Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square**

**City Library | Ashhurst Community Library | Linton Library**

---

**Heather Shotter**

**Chief Executive, Palmerston North City Council**

**Palmerston North City Council**

**W pncc.govt.nz | E info@pncc.govt.nz | P 356 8199**

**Private Bag 11034, 32 The Square, Palmerston North**



## **INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING**

4 November 2020

### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

NOTE: The Infrastructure Committee meeting coincides with the ordinary meeting of the Community Development Committee. The Committees will conduct business in the following order:

- Community Development Committee
- Infrastructure Committee

#### **1. Apologies**

#### **2. Notification of Additional Items**

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson's explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

#### **3. Declarations of Interest (if any)**

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.

**4. Public Comment**

To receive comments from members of the public on matters specified on this Agenda or, if time permits, on other Committee matters.

(NOTE: If the Committee wishes to consider or discuss any issue raised that is not specified on the Agenda, other than to receive the comment made or refer it to the Chief Executive, then a resolution will need to be made in accordance with clause 2 above.)

**5. Presentation - Countdown** Page 7

**6. Presentation - NZTA** Page 9

**7. Confirmation of Minutes** Page 11  
 “That the minutes of the Infrastructure Committee meeting of 7 October 2020 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.”

**8. Notice of Motion - Zebra crossing on James Line** Page 15

**9. Committee Work Schedule** Page 25

**10. Exclusion of Public**

To be moved:

“That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

*[Add Third Parties]*, because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].



## **PRESENTATION**

**TO:** Infrastructure Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 4 November 2020

**TITLE:** Presentation - Countdown

---

### **RECOMMENDATION(S) TO INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

1. That the Infrastructure Committee receive the presentation for information.

---

### **SUMMARY**

Mr Matthew Grainger, Acting General Manager Format, Development and Property of Woolworths New Zealand Limited, will make a presentation regarding the new distribution hub currently under construction and an update on the Pioneer Highway site plans.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil





## **PRESENTATION**

**TO:** Infrastructure Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 4 November 2020

**TITLE:** Presentation - NZTA

---

### **RECOMMENDATION(S) TO INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

1. That the Infrastructure Committee receive the presentation for information.
- 

### **SUMMARY**

Mr Lonnie Dalzell, Owner Interface Manager, and Mr Mark Long, People, Safety and Culture Manager, from Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, will make a presentation providing an update on the Te Ahu a Turanga: Manawatū Tararua Highway.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil



# PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 07 October 2020, commencing at 9.02am

<b>Members Present:</b>	Councillor Vaughan Dennison (in the Chair), The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Lew Findlay QSM, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.
<b>Non Members:</b>	Councillors Renee Dingwall, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta and Lorna Johnson.
<b>Apologies:</b>	The Mayor (for early departure on Council Business).

The Mayor (Grant Smith) was not present when the meeting resumed at 11.15am. He was not present for clauses 33 to 36 inclusive.

### 31-20      **Apologies**

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Billy Meehan.

#### The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 31-20 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

#### **For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

### 32-20      **Presentation - Soho Group**

Sam Wallace, Managing Director of Soho Group, made a presentation regarding the Soho Group's new multi-storey housing development nearing completion on Pioneer Highway and Church Street, Palmerston North.

Mr Wallace advised that Soho Group's mission contributed to the increase of social housing supply throughout the country, especially in the regions. They owned the properties they build and worked towards providing the best service to the tenants.

The project under development was a social housing project, the first of its type in the city, consisting of 46 one and two bedroom units over five blocks, and completion was expected on 4 February 2021. Mr Wallace stated that it

was a long term commitment from Soho Group to the community.

They chose wooden construction instead of materials like concrete and steel, which had advantages such as a better environmental impact, avoiding the use of cranes and related costs, and a shorter construction period. The resource consent process lasted 63 working days.

Finally, Mr Wallace advised that they planned future projects in the city following the Church Street model and looked forward to working collaboratively with Palmerston North City Council.

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

**The COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Infrastructure Committee receive the presentation for information.

Clause 32-20 above was carried 16 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

The meeting adjourned at 9.33am.

The meeting resumed at 11.15am.

The Mayor (Grant Smith) was not present when the meeting resumed at 11.15am.

**33-20**

**Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

**The COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the minutes of the Infrastructure Committee meeting of 2 September 2020 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 33-20 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

**34-20**

**Arena Redevelopment Quarterly Update**

Memorandum, presented by Bryce Hosking, Manager - Property.

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

**The COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the memorandum entitled 'Arena Redevelopment Quarterly Update'

presented to the Infrastructure Committee on 7 October 2020 be received for information.

Clause 34-20 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

**35-20**

**Infrastructure Capital Works Dashboard - August 2020**

Memorandum, presented by Geoffrey Snedden, Manager Project Management Office.

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Karen Naylor.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the August 2020 Infrastructure Capital Works Dashboard be received.

Clause 35-20 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

**36-20**

**Committee Work Schedule**

Moved Vaughan Dennison, seconded Susan Baty.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Infrastructure Committee receive its Work Schedule dated October 2020.

Clause 36-20 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

Councillors Vaughan Dennison, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas, Aleisha Rutherford and Tangi Utikere.

The meeting finished at 11.31am

Confirmed 4 November 2020

**Chairperson**



## NOTICE OF MOTION

**TO:** Infrastructure Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 4 November 2020

**TITLE:** Notice of Motion - Zebra crossing on James Line

**FROM:** Councillor Leonie Hapeta

### THAT THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE RESOLVES:

1. That the Chief Executive install a zebra crossing on James Line, next to the railway crossing.

## NOTICE OF MOTION

I, Councillor Leonie Hapeta, in accordance with Standing Orders 3.10.1, hereby GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION that I will move at the next Infrastructure Committee meeting on 4 November 2020 the following motions:

**"That the CE install a zebra crossing on James Line, next to the railway crossing"**

AND I further give notice that in compliance with Standing Order 3.10.2 the reason for the Notice of Motion include:

Council had originally planned for this and the community and the Principal have requested in numerous times. There are concerns around the safety of children crossing James Line to and from school.

Moved: Councillor Leonie Hapeta

Seconded: Councillor Aleisha Rutherford

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Officer's Response - Pedestrian crossing on James Line [↓](#) 

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Infrastructure Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 4 November 2020

**TITLE:** Notice of Motion - Pedestrian Crossing - James Line - Officer Advice

**PRESENTED BY:** Robert van Bentum, Manager - Transport and Infrastructure

**APPROVED BY:** Sheryl Bryant, Acting Chief Infrastructure Officer

---

### RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COMMITTEE

1. That the report entitled "Notice of Motion – Pedestrian Crossing – James Line – Officer Advice" and reported to the November 2020 meeting of the Infrastructure Committee be received.
  2. That the advice not to proceed with a pedestrian zebra crossing in James Line, due to reasons of safety, from the Manager – Transport and Infrastructure be noted.
- 

### 1. ISSUE

- 1.1 Council has recently completed several major investments to improve safety for pedestrians and other active transport users in the vicinity of the James Line railway crossing. This work has been in response to growing traffic volumes associated with planned residential development both in the Whakarongo Growth Area and adjacent greenfield areas.
- 1.2 The specific work in this section of James Line has included \$500,000 of investment in an upgraded railway crossing facility with barriers arms, lights and fenced chicane footpaths transitions on both sides of the road. Following completion of the crossing upgrade, Council installed two pedestrian crossing thresholds on both sides of the railway crossing to provide safe crossing locations with ramps on both sides of the road and protected pedestrian islands in the centre of the road (refer Figure 1).





*Figure 1: Installed Pedestrian Island North of Rail line*

- 1.3 The James Line road corridor is a key link from the surrounding residential area and the Napier Road State Highway connection to the city. As a result, this section of the network carries significant volumes of traffic throughout the day. Based on the function and operation of the road, Officers selected the pedestrian crossing points as the safest and most appropriate solution for the location.
- 1.4 The southern end of the Whakarongo Pathway terminates just west of the railway crossing. This facility provides a pedestrian and cycling link from James Line to the Whakarongo School. The pathway has become a key route for school children to and from the school. The use of the pathway significantly increased during the construction period of the Stoney Creek Road Safety Upgrade and this high level of use has been persistent following completion of the project.
- 1.5 The pathway is resulting in a significant number of school pick-ups and drop-offs occurring in the morning and afternoon by parents and caregivers in the vicinity of the railway crossing. As a result, there are significant numbers of children and caregivers looking to cross the road to and from the walkway. There is feedback that the pedestrian crossing points are not providing the priority for pedestrians desired at these peak periods in the day. Discussions with the school and concerned caregivers is that a higher level of service would be provided by a traditional pedestrian zebra crossing (refer figure 2) and that Council had previously committed to provide such a facility.



*Figure 2: Example of Pedestrian Zebra Crossing*

- 1.6 This brief memo report, outlines some of the factors which influenced the decision to select the current facility, discusses other options which could provide a higher level of service and reasons why providing a traditional pedestrian zebra crossing is not recommended.

## **2. FACTORS INFLUENCING COUNCIL DESIGN DECISION**

- 2.1 The primary objective in selecting a specific safety solution in any part of the transport network is and must be safety and whether the solution proposed will deliver improved or at least matched levels of safety. All pedestrian and safety improvement programmes attract NZTA funding on the basis that they achieve these safety outcomes.
- 2.2 As already outlined James Line is a key collector road within the Palmerston North network and provides connectivity from the Kelvin Grove residential area to the Napier Road State Highway corridor. As such, average speeds and traffic volumes are higher than most local roads within the network. In selecting the specific treatment, matters considered included:
- Average speed environment
  - Pattern and duration of pedestrian activity
  - Road geometry and sightlines
- 2.3 Speed and traffic data for the section of James Line near the railway crossing confirms operating speeds of 48km/h and a daily volume of traffic of 3,400 vehicles per day as of 17 March 2020. With the further development of residential subdivisions, greater traffic volume is expected in the future.

- 2.4 Observations of pedestrian use in the area confirm that outside the morning and afternoon school pick-up and drop-off windows comprising some 3 to 4 hours in total, numbers of pedestrian movements are low.
- 2.5 The road environment is accentuated as an access corridor given the limited number of accessways and absence of parked cars. This results in higher average speeds.
- 2.6 The above factors and considerations, guided by the latest advice and guidance from NZTA, as well as peer reviewed data on crash history for a range of pedestrian crossing solutions resulted in Officers selecting the pedestrian crossing solution constructed.

### 3. SAFETY EVIDENCE AND NZTA STANDARDS

- 3.1 Pedestrian safety is a key concern for all road controlling authorities. The recommendations around appropriate treatments to improve connectivity and ensure safe movement has continued to change over time in response to changes in traffic volumes and speeds and based on a growing body of crash data around the performance of specific solutions.
- 3.2 The traditional white line pedestrian zebra crossing with cross hatched poles and 'bellisha beacons' which was a familiar site for most of us in our youth has been supplemented by a wider range of treatments. Recent research evidence (refer "NZTA Pedestrian Planning Guide 2009" and "NZTA Guidelines for the selection of Pedestrian Facilities 2018") has assessed the safety performance of the range of pedestrian safety treatments including the 'traditional pedestrian zebra crossing'. A summary of the key advantages and disadvantages of pedestrian islands and pedestrian zebra crossings is presented in Table 1 as follows.

**Table 1. Comparison of Pedestrian Islands and Pedestrian Zebra Crossings**

	Pedestrian Islands	Pedestrian Zebra Crossing
<b>Advantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces the crossing area where pedestrians are in conflict with traffic</li> <li>Can reduce delays for pedestrians.</li> <li>Are particularly helpful to pedestrians unable to judge distances accurately or who have slower walking speeds.</li> <li>Estimated pedestrian crash reduction of 18 percent.</li> <li>Islands are more visible to oncoming drivers, and pedestrians can see oncoming traffic better.</li> <li>The localised roadway narrowing encourages lower vehicle speeds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides the least delay for pedestrians</li> <li>Creates a clear focus for crossings</li> </ul>

## PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can force cyclists closer to motorised traffic on narrower roads.</li> <li>• can be an obstacle which may be struck by motorised traffic if not particularly conspicuous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zebras tend to increase the rate of crashes by 28%.</li> <li>• Can lead to an increase in 'nose-to-tail' vehicle accidents.</li> <li>• Drivers may not stop when pedestrians expect them to.</li> <li>• Pedestrians may step out without checking properly whether approaching vehicles are too close to stop.</li> </ul>
Recommendations from NZTA	<p>Pedestrian islands are nearly always highly cost effective in improving pedestrian safety and reducing delay. They can be incorporated whenever a raised island is created as part of a roading scheme, for example deflection and splitter islands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be effective should be combined with kerb extensions, platforms or islands to reduce crossing distance and improve safety. Other crossing assistance facilities should be considered before installing zebra crossings.</li> <li>• Not advised in locations with fewer than 50 pedestrians per hour.</li> <li>• Unsuitable close to junctions as the drivers focus on the junction rather than the crossing, also forward visibility of the crossing may be less than desirable.</li> <li>• While zebra crossings provide pedestrians with priority over the traffic stream, this right is not always recognised, or adhered to, by drivers. Given the danger posed by moving vehicles, providing pedestrians with a false sense of security may be either unwise or irresponsible.</li> </ul>

- 3.3 The key findings of the research are that pedestrian zebra crossings provide poor safety outcomes unless they are installed in combination with effective speed management including traffic calming, raised pedestrian platforms or within slow speed environments e.g. inner-city slow speed zones.
- 3.4 Even in such environments the experience for pedestrians can be poor as evidenced by feedback from users of pedestrian zebra crossings around our own square.
- 3.5 Drawing on this and other research into pedestrian safety treatments and data on pedestrian crashes, NZTA updates their advice and guidance as set out in the Pedestrian Planning Guide. NZTA Officers have provided advice which mirrors the

wider technical advice and reflects current best practice in the provision of pedestrian safety treatments.

- 3.6 Legislative requirements in “Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004, which apply specifically to zebra crossings, place obligations on both drivers and pedestrians which are not well understood. The confusion contributes to some of the poor safety outcomes. Specifically the rules state:

*Rule 10.1 (1) A driver approaching a pedestrian crossing must:*

*(a) give way to pedestrians, and to riders of wheeled recreational devices or mobility devices:*

*(i) on the pedestrian crossing; or*

*(ii) obviously waiting to cross it; and*

*(b) if necessary, slow down and stop the driver’s vehicle for that purpose.*

*Rule 11.5 A pedestrian must not suddenly enter a pedestrian crossing when an approaching vehicle is so close to the pedestrian crossing that the driver of the vehicle is unable to give way to the pedestrian.*

- 3.7 While pedestrians have priority under 10.1, under rule 11.5 they are required to ensure they do not enter a crossing when a vehicle is so close that a driver has no time to react. This creates a requirement for the pedestrian to exercise judgement before entering the crossing. This is complicated further by the provision which says that a driver does not have to slow down for pedestrian crossings if there is no pedestrian waiting to cross it.
- 3.8 The number of pedestrian crashes and more specifically crashes on pedestrian crossings (zebras) recorded in Palmerston North is low except for three notable locations captured in NZTA’s crash analysis system (CAS):

- The pedestrian crossing on Ferguson Street between Pitt Street and Linton Street has had 5 pedestrian crashes between 2010 and 2019 (inclusive). In 2014 there was a pedestrian fatality, while in 2012 there was a serious pedestrian crash.
- The pedestrian crossing on Ruahine Street outside the hospital prior to being upgraded to pedestrian operated signals recorded 5 crashes between 2010 and 2014 (inclusive). The crashes include 1 Serious, 2 minor and 2 non-injury.
- The pedestrian crossings at the intersection of Square East and Main Street East (near the bus terminal) have recorded 6 crashes between 2010 and 2019 comprising 2 minor injury and 4 non-injury crashes.

- 3.9 The selection of pedestrian island on James Line was made based on several key principles linked to improving pedestrian safety. These principles were:
- Reducing the crossing distance reduces the safety exposure of pedestrians while crossing.
  - Enabling pedestrians to cross the road in two stages, reduces risk and complexity when crossing two lanes of traffic which is particularly important for young children.
  - Incorporating horizontal deflection (kerb extensions) reduces the speed of vehicles by reducing road width and therefore reduces the severity and likelihood of any crashes.
  - Requiring pedestrians and particularly children to decide to cross only when appropriate (no traffic or slow traffic) reduces the risk of them relying on the driver to make the decision to stop.

#### 4. OFFICER ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 As outlined in Section 2, Council Officers assessed a range of environmental and technical factors in the light of current best practice, evidence of safety outcomes and current NZTA guidance and technical advice to determine the best solution. The pedestrian crossing points provided are the best solution and do not compromise user safety.
- 4.2 Officers considered other options for improving the level of service for pedestrian including:
- Raised platform with pedestrian zebra crossing. While a practical solution with an improved safety outcome, the platform was considered to result in unacceptable impacts on access, noise and utility for the range of vehicles using the road including buses and trucks.
  - Kea Crossing. A key controlled crossing would provide more appropriately for the short periods of school student and care-giver activity however it would require the school to commit staff and/or students to operate facility. The option was not considered on the basis that that the school is nearly 1000m away and would require commitment from the school to staff any crossing.
- 4.3 Following feedback from the school and concerned parents and caregivers, Officers arrange a meeting at the school to listen to the concerns and provide an explanation of the reasons for the treatment selection. Officers agreed at that meeting to consider enhancements to improve the visibility of the crossing points including improved signs and pavement marking.



- 4.4 The option of a Kea crossing was not discussed. There is the possibility of installing in-situ folded signs either side of the current pedestrian crossing and making some minor line marking changes. This option will be discussed with the school.
- 4.5 As Transport professionals, Officers are required to ensure that any technical solution proposed not only meets the level of service sought but does so without compromising safety and sustainability. Any solution must necessarily balance a range of competing priorities however in all cases it is critical that the intervention on the balance of evidence and professional advice, must improve safety for the target group.

## 5. RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPLEMENTING ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION

- 5.1 Officers understand that the level of service may fall short of the expectations of the school community, however the solution provided is considered the best technical solution available given the constraints of the location, the needs of other road users and the importance of James Line in the overall network.
- 5.2 The proposal for the construction of a 'pedestrian zebra crossing' is not supported. There are at least three significant risks should Council wish to request replacement of the now constructed solution in contravention of the advice of Council Officers and NZTA staff.
- 5.3 Risk 1. Negative Safety Outcome: Based on the extensive international evidence record around pedestrian safety treatments, a 'standard pedestrian zebra crossing' is likely to result in a poorer safety outcome. If Council decides to instruct the Chief Executive to install a zebra crossing on James Line next to the railway crossing, it must assume the risk that its selection of a poor safety treatment will contribute to avoidable injury or even death.
- 5.4 Risk 2. Loss of NZTA Funding Support: In addition to the likelihood that any costs associated with removal of the existing pedestrian crossing points and construction of new pedestrian zebra crossings will not receive NZTA subsidy, Council's decision to require a treatment which is contrary to NZTA and Council Officer advice has the potential to put at risk NZTA counterpart funding for the entire minor safety programme – Programme 279 – Minor Road Safety Improvements with the potential to increase Council's capital investment obligation by \$400,000 to \$500,000 per annum.
- 5.5 Risk 3. Integrity of Design and Selection Process. Introducing non-technical considerations in the determination of a specific safety treatment for a specific location in the network puts at risk the integrity and prioritisation process being followed by internal and external experts.

**6. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide? If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual	<b>Yes</b>
Are the decisions significant?	<b>No</b>
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 2: A Creative and Exciting City	
The recommendations contribute to the outcomes of the Creative and Liveable Strategy	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in the Active and Public Transport Plan	
The actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and implement pedestrian and cycle focused improvements to intersection and road crossings</li> <li>• Upgrade, on a prioritised basis, pedestrian routes, connections and road crossings.</li> </ul>	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	The report outlines the considerations and factors assessed in determining the most appropriate safety upgrade solution for improving pedestrian connectivity in different parts of the network. The report outlines why 'standard pedestrian crossings' are no longer preferred and that alternatives such as pedestrian crossing points deliver better safety outcomes. The risk of Council seeking to implement safety solutions based on community preference rather than evidence supported advice and guidance from NZTA and Council Officers exposes Council to significant reputational and financial risk.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Nil



## COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

**TO:** Infrastructure Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 4 November 2020

**TITLE:** Committee Work Schedule


---

### RECOMMENDATION(S) TO INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

1. That the Infrastructure Committee receive its Work Schedule dated November 2020.

Please note that the Pedestrian Safety report will be included in item 7 'Six Month Transport Network Safety Update Report'.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Committee Work Schedule - November 2020 [↓](#) 

## INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

### COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE – NOVEMBER 2020

Item No.	Estimated Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction/ Point of Origin
1.	December 2020	Report on CET Arena Redevelopment (3 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		Council 7 October 2019 Clause 127.2
2.	December 2020	Infrastructure Capital Works Dashboard (Bi-monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
3.	December 2020	Papaioea Place Redevelopment Update (6 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
4.	December 2020	Streets for People Update (6 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
5.	February 2021	Facilities Management Reform (6 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
6.	February 2021	Roading Maintenance Contract (6 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
7.	March 2021	Six Month Transport Network Safety Update Report – 2019	Chief Infrastructure Officer	The pedestrian safety report will be encompassed in this report.	2 September 2020 Clause 27.2  Planning & Strategy Committee 2 September 2019 Clause 70.19
8.	March 2021	Asset Management Improvement Plan Update (6 monthly)	Chief Infrastructure Officer		
9.	September 2021	Update on infill lighting required to achieve compliance in P and V categories	Chief Infrastructure Officer		2 September 2020 Clause 28.2