

17 December 2019

David Harton
fyi-request-11466-00506efa@requests.fyi.org.nz

Kia ora David

The information you requested - CAS-07148-S8Y5H3

Thank you for requesting information related to the proposed roundabout design for Church Street and Victoria Street, Onehunga.

Please provide internal AT feedback on the design from your walking and cycling subject experts. These may be included in, but not limited to, emails, minutes of meetings, memos, or comments directly marked up on drawings

As the project developed from initial investigation we requested and liaised with walking and cycling experts and other subject matter experts. The proposal was sent to the following teams:

- Walking and Cycling Specialist
- Walking and Cycling Planning
- Urban Design

Auckland Transport's Walking and Cycling Specialist Team provided a written response during our internal consultation. I attach their feedback (attachment one)

Bike Auckland provided this feedback:

Bike Auckland supports the proposed raised roundabout as the traffic calming will benefit safety of all users, including people on bikes, and will benefit people on foot. Please ensure that the central island is indeed raised, and the mountable apron substantially high enough to deter speeding through (these elements are not detailed enough in the consultation plan to allow us to review them). Please definitely keep the 1:10 gradient ramps on the approaches. While not automatically positive, in this context we agree with the traffic islands being painted only - physical islands could create dangerous bike pinch points.

We provided the following response:

Thank you for providing feedback on the roundabout proposal at Church St and Victoria St, Onehunga.

In regard to the feedback about the central island, this was initially proposed to be a raised island with a mountable apron, however during the design process it was identified that this route is heavily used by HPMV trucks and is also a bus route. Therefore, this feature is required to be fully mountable.



The other features mentioned, such as 1:10 ramps and painted flush without islands will be retained going forward into the project.

If there is no feedback from these experts, please explain why

The Walking and Cycling Planning and Urban Design teams didn't provide a written response to the internal consultation. This is because during the conceptual stage the walking and cycling subject matter experts reviewed and supported the proposal and had no further changes to incorporate into the design.

Please provide an outline of the design process and how these experts are involved

Our design process is as follows:

1. Define the problem (i.e. a high-risk crash site) and analyse the issue. (In this case it was a strong vehicle against vehicle issue, with no vulnerable road user crashes.)
2. Undertake surveys, traffic modelling, and concept designs. (Design options are in line with NZTA's high-risk intersection guide, available [on their website](#))
3. Undertake internal pre consultation discussions.
4. Undertake consultation with relevant specialists. Assess feedback to determine if changes are required.
5. Undertake external consultation with the Local Board, key stakeholders and the public (in particular parties who are directly affected by the proposal). Assess feedback to determine if changes are required.
6. If required undertake a road safety audit to ensure safety issues are identified at an early stage.
7. Produce the detailed design.
8. Undertake a pre-construction road safety audit.
9. Undertake construction procurement.
10. A resolution is prepared and approved by the Traffic Control Committee.
11. Undertake construction.

Please explain why the recent updated AT standard roundabout design is not being complied with

Roundabout intersection controls with raised tables and zebra crossings are often the preferred control. However, there are several factors we consider when deciding what infrastructure to introduce. We decided to remove three of the four crossings because:

- a safety audit we undertook after external consultation raised concerns of restricted visibility for left turning vehicles;
- a low number of pedestrians were observed using the crossings. This is a concern because drivers may learn to not expect any pedestrians, causing their awareness and attention at the crossing to decrease and causing a safety issue.

Our proposal follows the NZTA's high-risk intersection guide (reference: transformational works, T1), as there is a very strong problem with drivers failing to give way, causing vehicle against vehicle crashes.



Auckland Transport's Urban Street and Road Design Guide (page 186), illustrates zebras on every approach. However, this shows an ideal situation (particularly cycle infrastructure) as well as listing recommendations. These recommendations are not always practical at each site. There are many different constraints to consider, such as:

- the physical space available;
- any restrictions to visibility;
- the existing road design;
- nearby land use requirements.

As you may be aware, through revision of the design, the proposal again provides all four crossings as per the original design. We believe that our current design plan will greatly improve the overall safety for all road user types.

Should you believe that we have not dealt with your request appropriately, you are able to make a complaint to the Office of the Ombudsman in accordance with section 27(3) of the LGOIMA Act and seek an investigation and review in regard to this matter.

Ngā mihi

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'PP Karma', is positioned below the 'Ngā mihi' text.

Randhir Karma
Group Manager – Network Management

Enc: RE_ Feedback requested due 17 January_ Church and Victoria St, Onehunga - Intersection Upgrade [MIP1718-419].pdf