

MEETING MINUTES

IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AT PEKA PEKA – WORKSHOP #2

DATE: TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER

TIME: 12:30-2:30PM

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION
1	Slides presented to the stakeholders to share work undertaken since Workshop 1	
2	<p>OPEN DAY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three options presented at open days – Option 1 and 2 at Peka Peka and Option 3 at Te Horo. • Feedback from open day showed Peka Peka had the majority of support however there was also limited support for the Te Horo option. • Overwhelming support to get on and do something • Of Option 2 supporters, most preferred Option 1 but chose Option 2 as felt it may have more chance of getting done. • Option 1 and Option 2 taken forward for further refinement. 	
3	<p>OPTION REFINEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise modelling report confirmed no impact if put in mitigation of concrete barrier and OGPA • Flooding – all options will require mitigation. However greater flood storage capacity would be required for Option 1 which would need additional land or bridging. • Transport modelling has been completed and economic analysis undertaken • Economic study of three options on Waikanae Town centre concluded no substantive impact. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Economic report was meant to compare Te Horo or Peka Peka impacts. This is to be checked that it is an either/or scenario. ○ Report saying main impact on Waikanae has been the expressway and the incremental development of ramps is not considered 	Commute

-
- Councillors have had a separate briefing regarding impacts of the expressway which is available on the KCDC website. Waikanae Township growth has been lower than other areas, growth has occurred at Waikanae beach.
 - Local road improvements to Peka Peka Road. Allowance in costing for shoulder widening but not kerb and channel. General feedback from open day was a preference for not kerb and channel
 - Impact on local road network
 - Review traffic volume numbers in presentation
 - Results show some changes to the local road network, but volumes are not significant
 - BCR incremental analysis shows that currently the additional benefits for Option 1 do not outweigh the additional costs for the option.
 - General discussion and questions
 - Discussion about the design departure required under the existing overhead bridge for the Option 2 southbound on-ramp. It was confirmed that improvements would be required on Hadfield Road around the on ramp.
 - It was confirmed that both options provided sufficient capacity for traffic growth.
 - Community feedback is that there is consideration of a connection between Huia Street and Hadfield Road for resilience. Significant subdivisions are also being considered in Waikanae East
 - Discussion about the strategy for reporting and if the report recommends Option 1 and it is not accepted for funding, can Option 2 be subsequently recommended. Agreed that SSBC needs to be worded carefully to reflect this.

4A

FEEDBACK – GROUP 1

- Option 1 preferred. Reasons include better safety performance, best future proofing, can better accommodate plan changes and additional development in the area
- Option 1 – much more legible and better meets investment objective 2
- Concern with Option 2 as people typically not good at merging. Considered that this design departure could have a high consequence albeit at a low risk of likelihood.
- GPS – safety is a big outcome so is important. Some safety issues on Hadfield Road

4B

FEEDBACK – GROUP 2

- Option 1 will need to clearly illustrate all the reasons for selection. This will include safety, quality infrastructure and it being an intuitively better solution
-

-
- It is considered that a high standard expressway has been built, so the quality of design should not be reduced for a short-term gain.
 - It is considered that the impacts from Option 2 on users of local road network could be more significant than the effects of noise and visual for the few landowners to the southeast of Option 1. Accessibility for land located near the expressway is a significant benefit for land owners.
 - Strategy is to bring down the cost for Option 1 slightly and really highlight benefits in SSBC
 - This is not part of the PP20 project. But SSBC would recommend parallel implementation
-

5

IMPLEMENTATION SCENARIO

- Question asked, "Would staged implementation be acceptable to the community?"
 - Number of concerns raised with this approach
 - Would the remaining ramp retain its BCR?
 - How could the funding be guaranteed for the remaining ramp?
 - Concern about escalation of costs which could further reduce the benefits for the remaining ramp.
 - Community is considering it as a holistic project and right outcome would be to deliver it all at once.
-

6

SUMMARY

- Confirmed that the stakeholders would support the recommendation of Option 1 for the SSBC
-

7

NEXT STEPS

- SSBC to be finished. Aiming for draft to be completed late November/ early December
 - Investment story to be tested with NZTA
 - KCDC will have opportunity to review the draft. Estimate that KCDC would require a week for an officer peer review. This wouldn't include response from elected members
-

POST MEETING NOTE

These notes capture a frank and open discussion between the Stakeholder Group and the Transport Agency. Strategies that were discussed as part of this meeting were given from the Stakeholder group as feedback to the Transport Agency and is not a reflection of Transport Agency actions.