

---

**CAS-PS8Y2-M1V1T9 - Keba Road - Pedestrian Improvements Project**

---

**Don Stock** <don.stock2@gmail.com>

4 March 2023 at 21:12

To: "Projects (AT)" &lt;projects@at.govt.nz&gt;

Cc: Desley Simpson &lt;desley.simpson@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz&gt;, "Andrew Garratt (AT)" &lt;Andrew.Garratt@at.govt.nz&gt;

Bcc: committee@missionbaykoho.co.nz

Hi Kristy

Thank you for your response last year to the issue raised about the Keba Road raised pedestrian crossing, and for committing to remedial work. We also understand that this work might be delayed due to recent storm events prioritising other work but look forward to its early completion as a matter of some urgency.

We would just like to confirm that our expectations for this work match. Since we last wrote, we have been inundated directly and on social media with complaints about the impact this bump is having on traffic flows. The Google Maps traffic layer clearly shows severe congestion (red and dark red) for some distance back to the east from the crossing during morning peaks, and yet this congestion mysteriously disappears immediately west of the crossing. It is therefore very clear that the crossing is significantly disrupting traffic flow on this important arterial route.

We have reviewed Auckland Transport's Raised Safety Platforms (Speed tables) – Practice Note 02 to better understand how AT designs speed tables and the rules that need to be followed.

With respect to traffic flows, I note the following from the last paragraph of 3.1:

"Raised safety platforms can affect flow of traffic, safety and comfort of some users and response times for emergency services. Their use must be reviewed by AT Subject Matter Experts when they are proposed on bus routes, freight routes or FENZ critical routes. Alternative safety treatments may be necessary in some of these cases."

I further note from 3.2:








"On arterial roads, ramp profiles are typically more comfortable than those used for local area wide treatment on residential streets, reflecting the buses, trucks, and emergency services that use these roads. ... These more comfortable ramp profiles are also less likely to create annoyance and community backlash ..."

and from 3.3:

"All FENZ critical routes are to be treated as arterial roads for profile selection."

Table PN02-1 outlines appropriate speeds and geometry for different types of roads.

Table PN02-1

Context		Profile			
Category – Future Connect	Target Speed at RSP (km/h)	Nominal grade	Approach ramp	Top (2)	Departure ramp
Arterial or Collector	50 	1:25	1900 x 75	6000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:25	1900 x 75	6000	1900 x 75
	40 	1:20	1500 x 75	6000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:20	1500 x 75	6000	1500 x 75
	30 	1:15	1150 x 75	4000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:15	1150 x 75	6000	1150 x 75
Collector – no bus service	30 	1:15	1500 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:15	1500 x 100	6000	1500 x 100
Local – bus service	30 	1:15	1150 x 75	4000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:15	1150 x 75	6000	1150 x 75
Local – no bus service (4)	30 	1:15	1500 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:15	1500 x 100	4000	1500 x 100
Local – no bus service (5)	25 	1:10	1000 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:10	1000 x 100	4000	1000 x 100

From all of the above, we conclude that the remediated ramp should be designed for an arterial road, with a 30km/h target speed, a 1:15 grade (3.8°) and a platform height of 75mm. Such a configuration should help alleviate the current congestion. Could you please confirm that the remedial work to be undertaken will conform to these AT rules.

If that is not the intention (and we note that the speed markings are currently 25 km/h, in violation of AT's own rules), then could you please send us a copy of the "Departure from Standard application" required in such circumstances to help us understand why not.

Regards  
 Don Stock  
 Chair  
 Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association  
 [Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

Table PN02-1








Context		Profile			
Category – Future Connect	Target Speed at RSP (km/h)	Nominal grade	Approach ramp	Top (2)	Departure ramp
Arterial or Collector	50 	1:25	1900 x 75	6000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:25	1900 x 75	6000	1900 x 75
	40 	1:20	1500 x 75	6000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:20	1500 x 75	6000	1500 x 75
	30 	1:15	1150 x 75	4000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:15	1150 x 75	6000	1150 x 75
Collector – no bus service	30 	1:15	1500 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:15	1500 x 100	6000	1500 x 100
Local – bus service	30 	1:15	1150 x 75	4000	3000 x 75 (1)
		1:15	1150 x 75	6000	1150 x 75
Local – no bus service (4)	30 	1:15	1500 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:15	1500 x 100	4000	1500 x 100
Local – no bus service (5)	25 	1:10	1000 x 100	4000	4000 x 100 (1)
		1:10	1000 x 100	4000	1000 x 100

image.png  
93K



image001.png  
36K