



WHANGANUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

Te Kaunihera a Rohe o Whanganui

AGENDA

Infrastructure Committee Meeting 23 July 2019

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Meeting of Infrastructure Committee will be convened on:

Date: Tuesday, 23 July 2019

Time: 1.00pm

Location: Council Chamber
101 Guyton Street
Whanganui

Kym Fell
Chief Executive

Infrastructure Committee**Membership**

Cr Alan Taylor (Chair), Cr Hadleigh Reid (Deputy Chair),
Mayor Hamish McDouall, Crs Charlie Anderson, Philippa Baker-Hogan,
David Bennett, Josh Chandulal-Mackay, Murray Cleveland, Helen Craig, Jenny Duncan,
Kate Joblin, Rob Vinsen, Graeme Young.
Wanganui Rural Community Board Representative: Mr Michael Dick.

Terms of Reference

- To discuss and make recommendations to Council on:
 - Water supply, stormwater and wastewater matters.
 - Roading and footpaths.
 - Waterways and natural drainage
 - Emergency Management (Civil Defence) matters.

Delegation to Committee: Decision-making on Parking Rules.

Items of business not on the agenda which cannot be delayed

Items not on the agenda may be brought before the meeting through a report from either the chief executive or the Chairperson. The meeting must resolve to deal with the item and the Chairperson must explain at the meeting, when it is open to the public, the reason why the item is on the agenda and the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting. Refer to Standing Order 9.11

Note: nothing in this standing order removes the requirement to meet the provisions of Part 6, LGA with regard to consultation and decision-making.

Discussion of minor matters not on the agenda

A meeting may discuss an item that is not on the agenda only if it is a minor matter relating to the general business of the meeting and the Chairperson explains at the beginning of the public part of the meeting that the item will be discussed. However, the meeting may not make a resolution, decision or recommendation about the item, except to refer it to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. Refer to Standing Order 9.12

Order Of Business

1	Opening	4
2	Apologies	4
3	Declarations of Interest	4
4	Confirmation Of Minutes	4
	4.1 Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 13 June 2019	4
5	Reports to Committee	11
	5.1 Actions Arising from Previous Minutes - July 2019	11
	5.2 Guyton Street and Victoria Avenue Intersection	14
	5.3 New Zealand Transport Agency Funding Re-prioritisation May 2019	23
	5.4 Emergency Management Activity Report	26
	5.5 Waste Water Treatment Plant Financial Update	27
6	Motion to Exclude Public	29
7	Confidential Reports to Committee.....	31
	7.1 Waste Water Treatment Plant Operational Update	31
8	Motion to Reopen the Meeting to the Public	31

1 OPENING**2 APOLOGIES****3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Elected Members will be provided with the opportunity to declare any disclosable pecuniary or other non-pecuniary interest in any matter to be considered at this meeting, or declare any new conflicts that have arisen since last completing the Elected Members' Interests Register.⁴ Confirmation Of Minutes

4.1 MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13 JUNE 2019

Author: Kim Fielder - Governance Services Officer

Authoriser: Kate Barnes - Senior Democracy Advisor

References: 1. Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 13 June 2019

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

1. THAT the Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 13 June 2019 are confirmed as a true and correct record.



**WHANGANUI
DISTRICT COUNCIL**
Te Kaunihera a Rohe o Whanganui

MINUTES

Infrastructure Committee Meeting

13 June 2019

Order Of Business

1	Opening Prayer / Karakia	3
2	Apologies	3
3	Declarations of Interest	3
4	Confirmation Of Minutes	3
4.1	Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 16 April 2019	3
5	Reports to Committee	4
5.1	Actions Arising from Previous Minutes	4
5.2	Taupo Quay and Drews Avenue Pedestrian Safety Review	5
5.3	Infrastructure Activity Report	5
5.4	Emergency Management Activity Report	6

**MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 101 GUYTON STREET, WHANGANUI
ON 13 JUNE 2019 AT 1.00PM**

PRESENT: Cr Charlie Anderson, Cr Philippa Baker-Hogan, Cr Josh Chandulal-Mackay, Cr Murray Cleveland, Cr Jenny Duncan (Deputy Mayor), Cr Kate Joblin, Mayor Hamish McDouall (Mayor), Cr Hadleigh Reid, Cr Alan Taylor, Cr Rob Vinsen, Michael Dick (Whanganui Rural Community Board Representative)

APOLOGIES: Cr David Bennett, Cr Helen Craig

IN ATTENDANCE: Kym Fell (Chief Executive), Mark Hughes (General Manager Infrastructure), Brent Holmes (Senior Roading Engineer), Tim Crowe (Emergency Manager), Kate Barnes (Senior Democracy Advisor), Kim Fielder (Governance Services Officer)

1 OPENING

2 APOLOGIES

Committee Resolution 2019/1

Moved: Cr Josh Chandulal-Mackay

Seconded: Cr Hadleigh Reid

That apologies from Cr David Bennett and Cr Helen Craig are received and leave of absence granted.

CARRIED

Apologies from Cr Baker-Hogan for lateness and Cr Joblin for leaving early were noted.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no new declarations of interest.

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16 APRIL 2019

Author: Kim Fielder - Governance Services Officer

Authoriser: Kate Barnes - Senior Democracy Advisor

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the decision is not significant.

Committee Resolution 2019/2

Moved: Cr Hadleigh Reid

Seconded: Cr Jenny Duncan

1. THAT the Minutes of the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 16 April 2019 are confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED**5 REPORTS TO COMMITTEE****5.1 ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES****Author:** Kim Fielder - Governance Services Officer**Authoriser:** Kate Barnes - Senior Democracy Advisor**Significance of decision** – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the decision is not significant.**Discussion**

Action 5 – A Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue Intersection Update report was to be brought to the Infrastructure Committee meeting held 23 July 2019. **ACTION – Brent Holmes**

Cr Baker-Hogan arrived at 1.20pm

Mark Hughes and Brent Holmes responded to questions and provided clarification regarding:

Action 2 – Progress with New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) funding application.

Action 3 – The Dublin Street Bridge investigation report request.

Action 1 – Progress with Fitzherbert Avenue extension.

Action 6 – Discussions underway with Forestry representatives.

Action 8 – Cr Cleveland had received concerns from public regarding the traffic management around Mosston School, which were to be forwarded to Council officers.

Committee Resolution 2019/3

Moved: Cr Alan Taylor

Seconded: Cr Hadleigh Reid

1. THAT the information is noted.

CARRIED

5.2 TAUPO QUAY AND DREWS AVENUE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY REVIEW

Author: Brent Holmes - Senior Roading Engineer

Authoriser: Mark Hughes - General Manager Infrastructure

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the decision is not significant.

Discussion

Council officers provided clarification to Councillors regarding details of the report.

Committee Resolution 2019/4

Moved: Cr Rob Vinsen

Seconded: Mayor Hamish McDouall

1. THAT the Taupo Quay and Drews Avenue Safety Memo Review of an alternative proposal to the pedestrian facility layout, by GHD Senior Safety Engineer, is received and that the Chief Executive continues with the previously identified minor matters.

CARRIED

5.3 INFRASTRUCTURE ACTIVITY REPORT

Author: Hannah Bailey - EA to GM Infrastructure

Authoriser: Mark Hughes - General Manager Infrastructure

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the decision is not significant.

Discussion

Mark Hughes responded to questions regarding:

- The Government Policy Statement on Transport which was discussed at the workshop held with Ministry of Transport officials in Palmerston North.
- Power supply disruptions to Council infrastructure and the systems in place to provide cover when required.
- Progress on the Mill Road project.
- Wikitoria Road culvert replacement was to be larger than intended. It was confirmed that due to lack of availability the larger culvert was to be installed with minimal price increase.
- The financial summary, as at 31 May 2019, provided in the report. A full financial report on the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) will come to the Strategy and Finance Committee. **ACTION – Mike Fermor**
- Kauarapaoa Road bridge was considered low risk as long as the current weight restrictions were adhered to.

At 2.04pm Chair Cr Taylor relinquished the Chair and left the table.

Deputy Chair Cr Reid assumed the Chair.

At 2.05pm, Cr Taylor reassumed the Chair.

At 2:05 pm, Cr Kate Joblin left the meeting.

- The current status of WWTP consents was explained.

Cr Young expressed concerns regarding insufficient reporting on the price difference between tenders accepted and actual job costs. The Chief Executive said he would take the request on board.

Committee Resolution 2019/5

Moved: Cr Jenny Duncan

Seconded: Cr Charlie Anderson

THAT the information is noted.

CARRIED

5.4 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

Author: Tim Crowe - Emergency Manager

Authoriser: Bryan Nicholson - Chief Operating Officer

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the decision is not significant.

Committee Resolution 2019/6

Moved: Cr Charlie Anderson

Seconded: Cr Murray Cleveland

THAT the information is noted.

CARRIED

The Meeting closed at 2.20pm.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on 23 July 2019.

.....
CHAIRPERSON

5 REPORTS TO COMMITTEE

5.1 ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES - JULY 2019

Author: Kim Fielder - Governance Services Officer

Authoriser: Kate Barnes - Senior Democracy Advisor

References: 1. Actions Arising from Previous Minutes

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

THAT the Infrastructure Committee receive the report – Actions Arising from Previous Minutes - July 2019.

Executive Summary

A summary of actions arising from previous minutes is attached (**Ref 1**).

N ^o	Item	Resolution	Action	% Completed
1	Council Meeting 8 May 2018 3. Fitzherbert Avenue/Totara Street Safety Improvements	<p><u>THAT</u> options for the crossing of pedestrians on Fitzherbert Avenue are investigated and reported back to the Infrastructure Committee.</p>	<p>Brent Holmes Fitzherbert Avenue/Totara Street intersection safety improvements successfully implemented.</p> <p>Further assessment to be undertaken within Fitzherbert Ave extension investigations for additional effects of potential increase in road hierarchy. Detailed design being undertaken in 2019/20 financial year</p>	25
2	Wakefield Street Bridge	<p><u>THAT</u> Council continues with the project as outlined in the Long-term Plan, contingent on NZTA funding.</p>	<p>Brent Holmes Point of Entry application submitted January 2019 for detailed business case approval. NZTA funding decision pending.</p>	95
3	Dublin Street Bridge	<p><u>THAT</u> Council await the results of the new NZTA application for funding.</p>	<p>Brent Holmes NZTA funding decision for a detailed investigation of the Dublin Street Bridge is pending.</p>	95
4	Infrastructure Committee 3 October 2018 8. Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue Intersection	<p><u>THAT</u> Whanganui District Council conducts a roundabout trial at the Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue intersection.</p> <p><u>THAT</u> Whanganui District Council accepts Mainstreet Whanganui’s offer to contribute up to \$5,000 toward a roundabout trial at the Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue intersection.</p> <p><u>THAT</u> a report on the effects of a roundabout at the Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue intersection be provided to the Infrastructure Committee at the completion of the trial.</p> <p><u>THAT</u> opportunity be given for public feedback during the trial on the proposal for a roundabout at the Guyton Street – Victoria Avenue intersection, including information on the likely ratepayer cost.</p>	<p>Brent Holmes Proposed trial on hold following receipt of external safety audit. This audit highlighted serious concerns regarding proposed actions to meet required brief. Mainstreet chairman has been briefed on report recommendations. Refer to Item 5.2 of this meeting.</p>	50

5	Council meeting 12 February 2019 Public Forum	<u>THAT</u> Mosston School's concern on traffic management, lack of cycleways at Mosston Road/Springvale Road/Tayforth Road is referred to the Infrastructure Committee.	Brent Holmes Initial field visit undertaken by Officer at school peak time to witness activity including discussion with school patrol and Police safety liaison Officer. Was been referred to external safety audit report and traffic survey for further recommendations. Initial mitigation measures including no parking lines and upgraded signage has been undertaken. Currently costing extension of footpath link.	60
---	---	--	--	----

5.2 GUYTON STREET AND VICTORIA AVENUE INTERSECTION

Author: Brent Holmes - Senior Roading Engineer
Authoriser: Mark Hughes - General Manager Infrastructure
References: Nil

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

The Infrastructure Committee recommends that Council annuls the proposed trial roundabout at the Guyton Street and Victoria Avenue Intersection, due to design safety audit findings on pedestrian safety, practicality of temporary construction, and identified increased costs, and disruption to existing amenities to implement.

Executive summary

The purpose of this report is to highlight significant safety and practicality concerns with the proposed trial roundabout design to Guyton Street and Victoria Avenue, and the inability to implement a trial, with the necessary substantial modifications required, that will still offer meaningful information pertinent to the original brief.

The original intention of the trial brief was to better foster pedestrian priority movement, to link the upper Victoria Avenue (Guyton St to Ingestre St) block, following retailers concerns of isolation away from the CBD hub in the lower Victoria Avenue.

The safety audit undertaken for the trial design, advises that the improvement in vehicle movement efficiency would be minimal at best, and that the pedestrian movements (particularly vulnerable users) would in fact be further compromised, negating the original intention to improve the pedestrian link.

The costs of the trial, to undertake safely, is significantly more expensive than initially envisaged.

The New Zealand Transport Authority (NZTA) would not provide funding support for the trial or a permanent solution derived from the trial.

Background

As previously detailed in report to Infrastructure Committee 3 October 2018.

Mainstreet Whanganui made a submission to Whanganui District Council's Long Term Plan 2018-2028 for the intersection controls on Guyton Street and Victoria Avenue to be changed from traffic signals to a roundabout (of similar dimensions to the one at the intersection of Ridgway Street and Victoria Avenue). Council resolved that this matter should be taken to the Town Centre Regeneration Steering Group and the outcomes then taken to the Infrastructure Committee for its deliberation.

The current signalised intersection works effectively and efficiently in separating the average daily vehicles approaching the intersection from each direction from the town centre vulnerable users (pedestrians). Most (70%) pedestrian movement is across Guyton Street (up/down Victoria Avenue).

Crash data showed that there had been no vehicle versus pedestrians at this site in the last five years.

The principal reason for Mainstreet Whanganui's request was to give pedestrians priority movement across this intersection, between the third and fourth blocks of the town centre as an improved connection mode to better promote the fourth block to the Central Business District (CBD) theme.

This same issue was considered by Council in the early 1990's, but the decision was to maintain traffic signals at this intersection.

The roundabout proposal was to allow a free flowing intersection, yet be controlled by the pedestrian movement at this intersection through pedestrian (zebra) crossings at each leg of the intersection.

The key issues related to the high number of pedestrians at peak times (one pedestrian every 15 seconds crossing Guyton Street) having too much impact on the road transport network, and the consequent effects on the surrounding road transport network.

The Town Centre Regeneration Steering Group had recommended (with Mainstreet Whanganui support/co-funding) that a trial be carried out to assess the impact of switching off the traffic signals and installing a temporary roundabout/pedestrian crossings, and monitoring the effects on vehicular traffic – rather than carrying out a more expensive network modelling exercise.

From a vulnerable users' perspective at this site, a roundabout is a greater crash risk for cyclists, and pedestrian (zebra) crossings are a greater crash risk for pedestrians than traffic signals. The provision of a pedestrian (zebra) crossings do, however, align with the traffic management plan currently in place for the town centre along Victoria Avenue.

A factor to consider is that the Guyton Street link is currently an important route for the police, fire and ambulance services, across the axis of Whanganui (i.e. Victoria Avenue).

Furthermore a roundabout within the confines of a CBD zone would prevent Heavy Commercial Vehicles (trucks and buses) from turning right due to the consequent tight radius created.

The cost to install a small roundabout and four (4) raised pedestrian crossings was estimated in the order of \$350,000 and another \$100,000 to remove the existing traffic signals. Because there are no crashes to mitigate at this site and is in fact an increased pedestrian vs vehicle crash risk, there are no consequent benefits for the investment costs, hence this \$450,000 project would not be up for NZTA co-investment and would have to be funded through rates or alternative sources.

The Infrastructure Committee made a resolution on 3 October 2018 to undertake a trial installation of a temporary roundabout and pedestrian crossings over a six week period in 2019. Mainstreet verified contributing \$5,000 towards this trial noting it was expected that the cost of this trial option would be in the order of \$5,000. This trial was seen to be a simple way of assessing the impact of traffic on the surrounding road network and gauging public opinion on the matter.

Recent findings since the resolution passed by the Infrastructure Committee

A safety audit was undertaken on the trial roundabout design in February 2019 prior to its planned implementation in April 2019. The trial roundabout design is six metres diameter using raised delineator posts and marked pedestrian crossings to all four quadrants to be marked on the line of the existing walkway.

Victoria Avenue is the main street running through the commercial retail business area of Whanganui. It has two through traffic lanes with angle parking along both sides of the street. Traffic speeds are very slow most of the time with an estimated operating speed of around 20 to 30 km/h even though the permanent speed limit is set at 50 km/h.

Estimated average daily traffic volumes on Victoria Avenue are as follows:

- Ingestre Street to Guyton Street 5,340 vehicles per day
- Guyton Street to Maria Place 8,100 vehicles per day

It is noted that raised pedestrian crossing platforms are located at regular intervals between Ingestre Street and Taupo Quay to slow traffic down and ensure pedestrians and traffic can safely interact.

Guyton Street is the main arterial route connecting Heads Road in the south with the CBD and on to Somme Parade in the north. It links traffic with SH3 in the south, the hospital and suburbs such as Gonville and Castlecliff while in the north it links to SH4 via the Dublin Street Bridge, the cemetery and suburbs like Aramoho and Whanganui East. It also has two through traffic lanes with parallel parking along both sides of the street with arrows to show drivers which lane they should be in to make their way through the intersection.

Traffic Speeds on Guyton Street are governed by the presence of three sets of traffic signals spaced at short distances at and south of Victoria Avenue. It is estimated that the operating speed of freely moving traffic on Guyton Street is around 40 km/h although the permanent speed limit is actually 50 km/h.

Estimated average daily traffic Volumes on Guyton Street are as follows:

- Between St Hill Street and Victoria Avenue 6,000 per day
- Between Victoria Avenue and Wicksteed Street 5,300 vehicles per day

All four approaches to the intersection are divided into two lanes, each marked with arrows to show drivers which lane they should be in to make their way through the intersection legs. A roundabout would not have this filter, with only a single mode of entry available into the roundabout. A line of raised delineators would be required to close off one of the approach lanes which could lengthen the stacking effect.

Issues raised in the design safety audit with the proposed roundabout proposal

- This intersection is located at the junction of two significant arterial routes in the centre of the commercial business district of Whanganui. Each leg carries substantial traffic volumes crossing the town centre. There is a strong potential for the roundabout to cause significant delays to traffic on Guyton Street and lead to undue congestion in the centre of town with an increased stacking effect.
- If a roundabout is required to allow traffic to turn around in the Avenue and go back in the opposite direction, it could be considered more prudent to install the trial roundabout at the

Ingestre Street intersection at the very top end of the CBD block, rather than at Guyton Street, otherwise motorists are only traversing three of the available four blocks.

- If the roundabout is located at Guyton Street, retailers in the top block may consider themselves disadvantaged as circulating flows within the CBD will be confined to the blocks along Victoria Avenue and Ridgway Street. Pressure will then likely arise to install a roundabout at Ingestre Street as well as at Guyton Street intersection. This would have the effect of cancelling out the benefits desired in connecting the top block of town to the lower blocks.
- A roundabout will prevent right-hand movement for trucks and buses due to the consequent tight radius.
- The proposed layout does not match the existing roundabouts along Victoria Avenue at Maria Place and Ridgway Street. This could lead to confusion for both drivers and pedestrians using the new layout for the first time. It was recommended the proposed trial roundabout layout be redesigned to mimic the other existing roundabouts along Victoria Avenue.
- The funeral procession route runs along Guyton Street from the Dempsey and Forrest Funeral Home as they head out toward the Aramoho Lawn Cemetery. Installing a roundabout at the Guyton/Victoria intersection is likely to result in great difficulty for the cortege to move uninterrupted through this intersection. This route could be changed however.
- There is no limit line between the proposed pedestrian crossings and the roundabout to indicate to drivers exiting the roundabout where they are to stop to give way to pedestrians on the design concept drawing. This is a legal requirement for a pedestrian crossing.
- The proposed locations for the pedestrian crossings are too close to the roundabout and need to be relocated further back so at least one vehicle can stop clear of the roundabout to Give Way to pedestrians using the crossing. There is a strong likelihood of pedestrian safety being compromised in its current layout.
- Unless a physical barrier is placed between the footpath and the roundabout, pedestrians could easily step out onto the roadway into the path of vehicles negotiating the roundabout rather than using the pedestrian crossings provided. It was recommended physical barriers be placed around the edge of the footpaths between each adjoining pedestrian crossing to ensure pedestrians are guided to the pedestrian crossings where they are supposed to cross each leg of the intersection. This situation would negate the brief to give pedestrians priority movement by making them detour further around Guyton Street to loop back round to their destination in the Victoria Ave top block.
- There are no central traffic islands on the Guyton Street legs to guide drivers into the correct approach to the roundabout. It is recommended temporary traffic islands be placed in the centre of Guyton Street to clearly separate opposing traffic lanes and guide drivers into the intersection correctly.
- The central traffic islands need to have some deflection built into them to force drivers to first turn left into the roundabout before the negotiate their way passed the central island of the roundabout. This will also apply to the way the proposed delineator posts are set out on the approaches to the roundabout.
- The central roundabout traffic island was proposed to consist of a number of delineator posts. These will not be much of a barrier for drivers and they are likely to be knocked over by passing traffic or vandals and become a hazard. It was suggested that something like a round concrete

trough of say 3 metres diameter be set in the middle of the roundabout to supplement the delineator posts to ensure the roundabout configuration is retained at all times.

- The lane arrows painted on the traffic lanes on the approaches to the roundabout will create confusion in the minds of approaching drivers if left as they are. They will need to be covered up or removed to ensure there is a consistent message relayed to drivers as they approach and enter the roundabout.

Recommendations from the design safety audit for the proposed roundabout proposal

- Ascertain if the traffic flows entering the proposed roundabout will be balanced to ensure efficient flow of traffic through the intersection without any undue holdups and congestion problems occurring on either leg.
- Consider setting up the roundabout trial at the Ingestre Street / Victoria Avenue intersection rather than at Guyton Street so the whole retail section of Victoria Avenue can benefit from traffic being able to go up and down the Avenue rather than leaving out the top block from the trial. This would retain the traffic signals at Guyton Street to facilitate better movement of traffic across Victoria Avenue and retain the safer situation for pedestrian movements.
- Modify the layout of the trial roundabout to match those already in existence at the Maria Place and Ridgway Street intersections with Victoria Avenue.
- Relocate the temporary pedestrian crossings further back from the intersection so there is at least one car length between the exits from the roundabout and the limit lines in front of the pedestrian crossings.
- Consider installing a solid barrier wall, or bollards and chains to prevent pedestrians from stepping off the footpath onto the traffic lane around the roundabout and its approaches. These barriers will need to cover the full length of each section of footpath between the pedestrian crossings on each quadrant of the intersection. This will add significant cost to the trial.
- Install traffic islands on the Guyton Street legs of the intersection between the relocated pedestrian crossings and the entrance/exits of the roundabout.
- Reshape the traffic islands and kerb extensions so they guide drivers into the roundabout at the correct approach angle.
- Reinforce the traffic delineators set up around the central round traffic island in the roundabout to make it more substantial and less likely to be interfered with by traffic and/or mischief makers who may try to rearrange the cones in the intersection by installing something like a 3 metre diameter round concrete water trough or similar.
- Remove or cover the existing lane lines and turning arrows on each leg of the intersection to avoid confusion for drivers entering the roundabout. These markings should be removed or covered in such a way they are not visible to drivers when it is wet and or dark.
- The trial will need to be regularly monitored to ensure any unforeseen traffic or pedestrian behaviours that could potentially create hazardous situations are identified early and countermeasures put in place to keep all people using the roundabout safe.

Key Issues

The design safety audit undertaken on the proposed \$5,000 temporary roundabout found significant safety and practicality issues with the required implementation.

A number of modifications not identified earlier, are required to implement a temporary roundabout. These modifications are more complex and intrusive than the original simplistic concept design, in order to have safety audit approval to proceed.

In order to re-locate the proposed temporary pedestrian crossings clear of the roundabout turning circle, and thus off the line of the existing pedestrian walkway, it was found that substantial amendments would have to be made to existing planter boxes, street furniture and roadmarking to accommodate that requirement, including reinstatement afterwards.

A line of barriers would have to be installed around each quadrant of the intersection to safely channel pedestrians further around the corner in order to cross the intersection with a safe clearance from the roundabout turning manoeuvre or run the risk of pedestrian conflict with vehicles.

In effect, approximately \$15,000 would be required to modify the intersection to comply with the minimum safety requirements to accommodate pedestrians. However this modification would substantially inhibit pedestrian efficiency wishing to cross the intersection, with the unfortunate effect of inhibiting the mainstay original intention of the brief. At the end of the trial approximately \$3,000 would also be required to reinstate the modified street furniture, kerbing and planter islands.

NZTA will not contribute to a roundabout as it is in direct contrast with their Safer Strategies approach in prioritising pedestrian and vulnerable users over motor vehicles and does not meet their funding criteria to its very low crash history in terms of pedestrian conflicts in its current form.

These findings were discussed with the Town Centre Regeneration Steering Group, and Des Warahi from Mainstreet. The conclusion was made within the group that the safe amendments required to implement the trial, are now negating the intention of the brief, and that the trial roundabout is less than ideal in this location.

Options

The following options are available to Council:

Status quo – To leave the intersection as it is, with effective and efficient traffic signal controls that safely separates both key movement modes. This option would allow the current high traffic volume across this intersection and also allows for pedestrians and vulnerable users to confidently and safely cross the road in platoons, on the signal phase.

Commit to implementing the full construction of a roundabout – This would incur a Council investment of \$450,000 based on original figures put forward by the previous Senior Roading Engineer.

Continue with carrying out a trial on the impact of a roundabout – Spend \$18,000 to implement the trial in a modified manner that does not unduly compromise safety to meet the safety audit requirements including reinstatement. However the original brief intentions are not likely to be met in terms of useful trial data.

Consider a roundabout trial on the intersection of Ingestre Street and Victoria Ave – It is important to note that a previously planned traffic lights upgrade is being undertaken at present to deal with matters already associated with this intersection.

Consider the investigation of a decorative raised pedestrian platform to the intersection of Guyton and Victoria Avenue Intersection, (possibly extending the brief to include the neighbouring intersection at Guyton Street and Wicksteed Street) – This scenario could aesthetically link the fourth block of Victoria Avenue to the lower three blocks to better meet the Mainstreet intentions of connection without compromising safety in its current form. No funding is available currently for this investigation.

Next steps

If Council determines to continue with the roundabout trial, a minimum of six weeks would be required to perform the work – two weeks of monitoring current traffic movements, a two week trial and monitoring consequent traffic movements, and two weeks for analysis/reporting.

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Fit with purpose of local government

The issue fits with the purpose of local government’s democratic decision making process on behalf of the community.

[Link: Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002](#)

Fit with strategic framework

Select checkboxes to indicate whether the decision / report contributes, detracts or has no impact

	Contributes	Detracts	No impact
Leading Edge Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Long-Term Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Infrastructure Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other Policies or Plans -	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The recommendation to annul the trial has no impact on the LTP, Infrastructure Strategy, or the strategic case of the AMP. However should Council choose to proceed with the implementation of the \$450,000 roundabout, then that decision will impact on the business case that underpins the AMP, Infrastructure Strategy and LTP.

Risks

The recommended decision has a very minor degree of risk.

The following risks have been considered and identified:

- Financial** risks related to the financial management of Council and the ability to fund Council activities and operations, now and into the future
- Service delivery** risks related to the meeting of levels of service to the community
- Reputation / image** risks that affect the way the Council and staff are perceived by the community - nationwide, internationally, by stakeholders, and the media
- Legal compliance (regulatory)** risks related to the ability of management to effectively manage the Council, comply with legal obligations and avoid being exposed to liability
- Environmental** risks related to the environmental impacts of activities undertaken by the Council. Includes potential or negative environmental and / or ecological impacts, regardless of whether these are reversible or irreversible
- Health, safety and wellbeing** risks related to the health, safety and wellbeing of Council staff, contractors and the general public when using Council’s facilities and services
- Information technology and management** risks related to the integrity of the Council’s IT network, including security, access and data management
- Infrastructure / assets** risks related to the inability of assets to provide the required level of service in the most cost effective manner
- Project completion** risk of failure to complete on time, on budget and to plan

A decision to annul the trial alleviates identified risks to pedestrians with implementing the trial.

Policy implications

The recommendation to annul the trial has no impact on the Long Term Plan 2018-28.

Financial considerations

There are no financial considerations associated with the recommendation to annul the trial. However if the decision is to proceed with the trial then the costs of \$18,000 exceed the \$5,000 contribution offered by Mainstreet Whanganui.

Nil Approved in LTP / AP Unbudgeted \$13,000

Legislative considerations

Egress for Emergency Services will have to be considered.

Significance

The recommended decision is considered not significant as per Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Engagement

Engagement has been carried out with the Town Centre Regeneration Group and Mainstreet. If the modified trial was to continue then consultation must be obtained from Emergency Services, public transport operators, and other stakeholders for road transport activities such as Automobile Association, Heavy Haulage (National Carriers Association) and Road Transport Association.

PRE-ENGAGEMENT Community groups / stakeholders	Date / Status	Techniques to engage
Mainstreet Whanganui		

CONSULTATION Community group / stakeholder	Level of engagement on spectrum	Techniques to engage
Community	Inform, consult and involve	Public notices Council website, facebook
Emergency Services	Inform, consult and involve	Direct Correspondence
Transport Stakeholder	Inform, consult and involve	Direct Correspondence

5.3 NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT AGENCY FUNDING RE-PRIORITISATION MAY 2019

Author: Brent Holmes - Senior Roading Engineer
Authoriser: Mark Hughes - General Manager Infrastructure
References: Nil

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

THAT the information is noted.

Executive Summary

On Tuesday 11 June 2019, a National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) meeting was held in Palmerston North, hosted by senior NZTA officials and board members who were travelling around the country to meet stakeholders regionally.

The meeting was attended by Mayor Hamish McDouall, Councillor Murray Cleveland, and Senior Roading Engineer Brent Holmes.

The purpose for these roadshows was for New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to consult on a number of funding “re-prioritisation” matters relating to the Road Controlling Authorities (being Councils), and in the case of Whanganui District Council, located inside the Horizons Regional Council geographical area.

Key information

It was explained by the senior officials that despite more money than ever before being allocated to the NLTP fund by central government, the fund was under extreme pressure nationally. A “re-prioritisation” of monies had been made at a national level. In effect we were to receive cuts to our applications in funding for key roading projects, despite some of these projects meeting all necessary criteria.

Whanganui, Manawatu, Tararua, and Horowhenua District Councils, and Palmerston North City Councils were to feel the effects of this in provincial areas, with several projects being allocated as “unlikely to approve”.

The projects in that “unlikely to approve” category for Whanganui District Council are:

- Bridge 15 (Erni’s) Kuarapaoa Road Renewal.
- Aramoho Railway Bridge Shared Pathway Renewal
- Heads Road, Beach Road, and Prince Street Intersection Improvements.

Bridge 15 (Erni’s) Kuarapaoa Road Renewal.

This particular bridge is rated at 44 tonnes, and is located on a very prominent logging route 10km up the Kuarapaoa Road and is showing extreme signs of deterioration. It is being monitored

rigorously with the intention to de-register the weight on the grounds of safety if necessary. Brent Holmes has met on three occasions with FOMS Forestry who have expressed concern at the hold up from NZTA for a stock standard programmed renewal and at their ongoing investment into Forestry blocks that rely on the long term viability of that bridge. The last correspondence with FOMS and Forest 360 in mid-May was to advise that the NZTA would not fund the bridge renewal as a result of information received at this “re-prioritisation” meeting. The forestry industry are very worried and are struggling to understand the decision noting the “billion trees planting” initiative.

The effect of that decision and its repercussions are potentially:

- Whanganui District Council to fund the renewal bridge outright, to maintain access
- FOMS to contribute to the bridge renewal
- FOMS and others to cart the long way round Rangitatau East and back to Whanganui log yards on a route that becomes not viable for the harvest and replanting of these trees, thus a negative bearing on the national GDP of logging harvests in our area (and other areas around the country also affected by the “re-prioritisation”).

Brent Holmes has requested FOMS and Forest 360 to do their sums on the basis of the bridge being renewed where they could potentially cart at 54 tonnes with a higher capacity renewal than the current 44 tonne that is damaging the existing bridge. FOMS to then consider a contribution to a new bridge on the basis of the extra efficiency found. We are waiting on the outcome of that business pondering, with a “proposal in principle” to be derived, before potentially bringing a business case to Council for consideration, once we have thrashed out the pros and cons of that heavier activity on the Kauarapaoa and Papaiti area.

Aramoho Railway Bridge Pathway Renewal

This is a surprising omission from NZTA noting it is a current walkway and is near the end of its useful life. Kiwirail support Council to renew it as it will present safety concerns due to derelict condition in the new few years. This is a project that should automatically fall into NZTA’s high priority list as it meets all of central government’s charters for promoting alternative transport modes for walking and cycling and is already in place for a straight renewal. Roading will keep pursuing this project.

Heads Road, Beach Road, and Prince Street Intersection Improvements.

This project does struggle to meet eligibility criteria for priority funding and it is not a great surprise to be omitted from funding.

Further information of note

Even more disappointingly, the previously promised Enhanced Funding Assistance Rate (TEFAR) is effectively being disestablished before it has even been distributed, with the proviso being that only “very high priority safety projects” being eligible for this criteria.

The TEFAR was offered to Councils back in late 2018 subject to approval in the Low Cost, Low Risk category for projects under \$1M in value in the three year funding block 2018-21. TEFAR was to be worth an additional 19.5% subsidy on top of our standard FAR of 61%, effectively being 80.5% subsidy for projects that were high on the central government agenda.

Whanganui District Council had applied for four tiers of TEFAR across a range of Whanganui District Council projects in early January 2019, in line with central government mandates for supporting priority projects. These projects in their tiers ranged from the top ranked categories to lower ranked categories as below:

1. Walking and Cycling Improvements – TEFAR value of \$478,725.00
2. Intersection Safety Improvements - TEFAR value of \$182,325.00
3. Safety on Local Roads - TEFAR value of \$46,800.00
4. Network Transport Links and Resilience Improvements - TEFAR value of \$322,335

The overall application was worth \$1.03M however the reasonable expectations were to receive around 50% of that in the top 2 categories. Noting that Whanganui District Council had previously adopted the central government mandate for walking and cycling projects it was considered a very strong case in that first category and very likely for the second category. Depending on other Road Controlling Authority uptake the TEFAR money was to filter down through the categories until it ran out.

Because TEFAR could not be applied retrospectively, 2 shared pathway projects (the larger stage 2 portion of London Street, and Whanganui East between the Aramoho Rail Bridge and Georgetti Road) were delayed while waiting for the TEFAR to be approved.

A receipt from NZTA was acknowledged on 8 January 2019 of our application, with the promise of the process to take 15 working days. To this day, Whanganui District Council have not received a letter to advise our TEFAR application. Whanganui District Council did not get any formal notice until the 11 June 2019 workshop that TEFAR was in fact, gone.

Frustratingly, one of the most productive dry summers in several years was not fully utilised and has caused some needless carryovers into 2019/20 due to procrastination on NZTA funding decisions. This frustration was felt across the country with most Roothing Managers, and will have likely contributed to a slow-down in growth due to many projects being placed on hold in the national market.

It was also mentioned to the attendees of the meeting that substantial funding was being allocated to Kiwirail, as also discovered in the recently announced Government budget 2019, being \$1B.

A number of letters have recently been sent to NZTA from Roothing Interest Groups expressing significant disappointment and disapproval at the process of the way the re-prioritisation was carried out at a national level, by NZTA making cuts in Wellington without local stakeholder engagement to present a case as to exactly why these projects are required.

5.4 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

Author: Tim Crowe - Emergency Manager
Authoriser: Bryan Nicholson - Chief Operating Officer
References: Nil

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

THAT the information is noted.

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on Emergency Management activity for the period 1 June – 23 July 2019.

The period saw ongoing “business as usual” activities with an emphasis on local training and capability development along with community engagement activities and liaison work with Taranaki Civil Defence. One NZ relevant tsunami alert was responded to by staff.

Key information

Emergency Operations Centre staff training included one Foundation and one Intermediate Course based on the national Civil Defence Integrated Training Framework as well as three days of training on messaging and related activities utilising the soon to be replaced Emergency Management Information System (EMIS). EMIS will be replaced by an Office 365 based system currently being tested by the Ministry of Civil Defence

The tsunami response was due to a large and shallow quake in the Kermadec area that initially met the criteria for a possible threat to New Zealand shorelines. The Operations Centre was opened and the situation monitored closely until the threat assessment was reviewed and cancelled nationally. Tsunami alerts in the Pacific Basin occur relatively frequently, being generated automatically in response to large regional offshore earthquakes. This was the first near New Zealand threat alert since the Kaikoura/Hurunui event.

5.5 WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT FINANCIAL UPDATE

Author: Mike Fermor - General Manager Finance

Claire Williamson - Projects Manager

Authoriser: Kym Fell - Chief Executive

References: Nil

Significance of decision – In terms of the Significance and Engagement Policy 2018, the recommended decision is not significant.

Recommendation

THAT the information is noted.

Executive summary

The new Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has been accepting and treating wastewater discharges from municipal and trade waste industries since July 2018. This report provides information to Council on overall income and costs to date.

Background

The 2018/19 budgets for the Wastewater activity, including the WWTP, were set by Council through the 2018-28 Long Term Plan after extensive consultation with affected parties. As requested by Elected Members, financial summaries for the WWTP have been provided during the year to the Infrastructure Committee to give Elected Members oversight of the operating costs of the WWTP.

Key issues

The following financial summary for the WWTP was provided to the June 2019 Infrastructure Committee:

Report as at 30 May 2019

	Actual YTD 2018/19	Approved Budget 2018/19	Remaining Balance 2018/19
Income			
Rates	4,019,780	4,385,214	365,435
Trade Waste Fees	308,438	1,250,000	941,562
Sundry revenue - permeate disposal	236,446	200	-
User fees and other income	4,564,664	5,635,414	1,306,997
Costs			
Electricity & Gas	740,199	1,410,000	669,801
Compliance costs	285,278	350,000	64,722
Personnel costs	410,316	544,163	133,847
Chemicals & polymer	404,910	730,000	325,090
Maintenance	627,059	450,000	(177,059)
Other Operating costs	84,836	221,889	137,053
Operating costs	2,552,598	3,706,053	1,153,455
Capital Expenditure	1,119,278	1,208,000	88,722

The financial model used as the basis for the 2018/19 budget was based on historical trade waste loads and flows and assumed that the plant would be fully operational for the full year. In reality the plant began operating in a limited fashion in July 2018 due to the sludge dryer not starting to operate until February 2019, albeit in a limited capacity. Given that the WWTP has not been fully operational for the year, the financial model remains the best information we have for a full year of operation.

The above financial summary has accrued trade waste fees for April and May as actual invoices will not be issued for the June quarter until late July/early August after final measures have been received from the laboratory. The final financial result for the Wastewater activity will not be known until mid-August.

As the financial summary shows, there have been budget underspends in a number of areas. This is due mainly to:

- Aspects of the plant, such as the dryer, not being fully operational for the full year. This has resulted in a reduction in energy and sludge related costs such as chemicals and polymer;
- Lower loads (COD & TSS) being received from industry. As a number of the operating costs of the WWTP are variable, lower loads reduces operating costs.

When discussing the new charging regime with industry, a key aspect was the opportunity for industry to achieve cost savings if they were able to reduce their loads. Savings achieved in this manner do not have an impact on the municipal 'pan tax' as the reduced trade waste fee income is offset by reduced operating costs. This opportunity has been realised as savings have been able to be achieved, through reduced trade waste fees, by industries reducing their loads. As the trade waste fees were set predominantly on the variable costs of operating the WWTP (as opposed to the fixed costs) then it would be expected that reduced trade waste loads would translate to operating cost underspends and reduced trade waste fee income.

In determining the design of the WWTP to accommodate the trade waste industries, the volume of flows was modelled to establish the scale or size of the WWTP required. These flows were modelled as the basis of establishing the capital charge to industry. Initial flow measures indicate the model to be reliable.

As with all Council activities, once final costs have been processed through the ledger, any surplus (or deficit) will be offset against loans within the activity.

In order to determine the true long-term costs of operating the WWTP it needs to be fully operational for an extended period of time, i.e. in context Council would need a minimum of 12 months with the plant fully operational. Until such time as Council has this data, it is prudent to continue with the budgets and rate levels as approved in year two of the Long Term Plan as that is the best information we have available at this time.

6 MOTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Recommendation

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7. Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
- (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

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 relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

ITEM NO.	GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	SECTION	SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT	PLAIN ENGLISH REASON
7.1	Waste Water Treatment Plant Operational Update	s7(2)(g), s7(2)(i)	Legal Professional Privilege, Negotiations	Potential negotiations with users and receiving legal advice

7 CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS TO COMMITTEE**7.1 WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT OPERATIONAL UPDATE****8 MOTION TO REOPEN THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC****Recommendation**

THAT the meeting be reopened to the public and the preamble, discussion and resolutions associated with item 7.1 Waste Water Treatment Plant Operational Update remains confidential until all parties have either accepted the terms of the proposals or agreed to cease negotiations. The Mayor and Chief Executive may then release a press report on the matter.