

Orakei Local Board
Auckland Council

3 May, 2023

RE: KEPA ROAD SPEED TABLE

Scott, Angus, Penny

Thank you for your further discussion on this issue at the Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association (MBKRA) meeting last night.

As noted, many people in the community have voiced frustration at the impact the speed table has on the flow of traffic. The impact is very real, with traffic backed up for a great distance and delays to travel times for road users from the surrounding suburbs. It has been observed that the resultant congestion has encouraged people into the quiet backstreets of Mission Bay to try and circumvent the traffic queues, making these narrow winding streets more dangerous for residents. Even following the remedial work to the crossing in March the situation has only barely improved.

It was unclear to me whether AT has responded to the queries raised by the Orakei Local Board last month. This is still a concern for residents and the issue will not go away until addressed. **We have serious lingering questions that have not been addressed.**

A summary of the history on this is as follows:

1. On 3rd June 2022, AT Resolution 17210 approved the construction of the raised table at the location of an existing crossing on Kepa Road:
 - The resolution states the Traffic Control Committee is *"of the opinion that these controls are a justified limitation on the right to freedom of movement on roads which **will not unduly impede vehicular traffic** using the road"* (emphasis added).
 - The resolution notes that *"Auckland Transport has identified that drivers are travelling too fast on Kepa Road near Coates Ave"*, although no supporting evidence is offered. It continues; *"the raised crossing will slow drivers to a safe speed..."* which is identified as **30km/h**.
 - The resolution states that *"External consultation was undertaken with adjacent landowners in February 2022. Overall, the adjacent landowners were supportive of the proposal."* However, the Appendix shows that of the 41 landowners that AT provided the plans to, 12 responded, with the **majority in opposition** to the proposal.
 - Consultation was not sought from the public, or *"other affected road users"*. AT notes that *"parties not consulted are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposal"*.
 - The design drawing attached to the resolution shows an approach ramp 1.5m long. The resolution states *"The crossing facility will be designed according to the TDM standards."*

2. In Sept/Oct 2022, AT's contractor installed a raised concrete crossing with asphalt ramps on Kapa Road. There was an immediate negative impact on traffic congestion, with delays of over 30 minutes experienced. This was discussed at MBKRA meeting 1/11/22.
3. MBKRA (Don Stock) contacted AT in early November, and was advised by AT on 14/12/22 that the slope had been surveyed and was **8.2%-9.2%**, which was steeper than designed. The contractor was going to fix the crossing at their expense.
4. MBKRA followed up via email on 4/3/23 with concern that no action had been taken, and asked for information on the design gradients, mindful of AT's published standards that conclude **a slope of 1:15, platform height of 75mm, and a target speed of 30 km/hr is appropriate.**
5. AT contractor adjusted approach ramps with additional asphalt on 18/3/23.
6. Response to MBKRA from David Nelson, AT on 24/3/23, stating that the work is completed and *"measurements of the raised pedestrian crossing will be carried out shortly to ensure that it meets AT's requirements."* Mr. Nelson notes *"The proposed design complies with the standards set out in the Transport Design Manual (TDM)".*

It is not entirely clear what the TDM (Transport Design Manual) standards variously referred to by AT describe. According to the AT website, the current relevant TDM standards include:

- TDM Engineering Design Code Traffic Calming Version 1
- Traffic Calming Standard Engineering Details (Working Draft for Review, 14 Feb 2020)
- Raised Safety Platforms (Speed Tables) Practice Note 2 (28/8/2022)

In Section 3.2 of the Engineering Design Code, one-way tables (i.e. Swedish tables, divided by a traffic island) on bus routes are to have a maximum height of 100mm, with an approach of 2.0m, resulting in a **1:20 approach slope.**

The Standard Engineering Details, and in particular TD0022 Speed Table – Swedish type for Frequent Bus Network, shows a ramp and table of concrete construction with a height of 75mm, an approach of 0.75m, and a **slope of 1:10.**

Practice Note 2, the most recent and detailed coverage of this topic, includes a table of profiles (Table PN02-1), noting that: *"The profiles are applicable to lifeline emergency use on FENZ, freight and PT [Public Transport] routes. All FENZ critical routes are to be treated as arterial roads for profile selection."* Table PN02-1 shows that arterial or collector roads should have speed tables with a **height of 75mm**, approach of 1.5m or 1.15m and a **slope of 1:20 or 1:15** depending on whether the target speed is 40km/h or 30km/h.

It is worth noting that the Kapa Road speed table signage currently indicates a **25 km/h** speed, which is not an option on Table PN02-1 for an arterial route.

We note the news article in the *NZ Herald* on 2/5/2023 highlighting errors in construction of a similar crossing in Grey Lynn installed in September 2022, with contractors now rebuilding the crossing ramps to "*the specified 1:15 gradient*".

The following questions beg a response:

- 1. What is the target speed and specified height, approach slope and material for the speed table on Kepa Road?**
- 2. Is this in alignment with the TDM Standards, and if so, how is conflicting information in the standards prioritised?**
- 3. Has the speed table been surveyed since the remedial work was completed to confirm it meets the design specification?**
- 4. Has AT reviewed resultant traffic flows, and does the result meet the Traffic Control Committee intent to "not unduly impede traffic"?**

There are examples of speed tables that do not impact the flow of traffic to the same extent – such as Apirana Ave (by Eastview Reserve), or Tamaki Drive (Mission Bay). We believe the Kepa Road crossing, while well intentioned, has had unforeseen impacts that are not in alignment with fundamental assumptions made by the designers. This needs to be examined closely, and whether this falls as a contractor cost for erroneous construction, or on AT for incorrect specification, the many users of the road would agree that the current installation is an unacceptable incursion on free movement around the area. There is a substantial economic cost to the community for time spent sitting in traffic – whether in a bus, a private vehicle, or a freight transporter. The cost of remedial work pales in comparison.

Please help us obtain a complete and considered response to our queries.

Jeff Robertson

MISSION BAY KOHIMARAMA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

cc:

Deputy Mayor Simpson

Simon O'Connor – MP for Tamaki