

Reshaping Streets regulatory changes

Submission from Auckland City Centre Residents Group

The table below identifies the proposals we are consulting on:

Proposal 1: A new approach for piloting street changes	
1A	<p>Provide RCAs with new powers and requirements to install pilots, and set requirements for how to install them</p> <p>CCRG are generally supportive of this approach providing that public notification is provided at least 7 days prior to a pilot commencing. This allows for any major disruption to people/business that RCA's may not be aware of, to be accommodated in the initial pilot design. Many of these streets will be residentially focussed so plans various households may have could be seriously impacted if they are not aware of a pilot – i.e. moving house, major house renovations, tree pruning, etc.</p> <p>We would expect that if the changes related to safety issues they would not be piloted but simply notified including the reasons for the changes.</p>
1B	<p>Enable pilots to be used as a form of consultation, with feedback collected during the pilot used to consider whether to make street changes permanent.</p> <p>CCRG agree with this idea BUT there must be a time limit imposed on the pilot and a clear means for the public to provide independent feedback – we would suggest six months is more than enough time and that the form of public feedback is freehand – i.e. citizens can write their own feedback rather than a fixed questionnaire format that predetermines the outcome RCA's want to hear.</p>
1C	<p>Enable pilots to be installed for up to two years</p> <p>This is not supported. A two year period is NOT a pilot for something as simple as minor street changes. Six months is more than enough time to obtain feedback as to whether the public like/agree with the changes and the reasons provided for its existence. It is assumed that permanent large scale changes of major roads/streets are not piloted – these should have gone through the appropriate level of professional design work with submissions sought during the design stages.</p> <p>It is important to separate small, local street pilots from major road changes that must go through the normal LGA consultation stages before any funding is committed to them.</p>
1D	<p>Amend the LGA1974 to make it clear that RCAs should not use the provision for 'experimental diversions' when piloting street changes.</p> <p>As this question is targeted at RCA's, CCRG has no comment</p>
1E	<p>Allow RCAs to lower the speed limit to support a pilot, in areas with a posted speed limit under 60km/h, during the pilot</p> <p>Supported, but again on the basis that there is public notification 7 days prior to changes being implemented.</p>
1F	<p>Update rules for trialling TCDs, so that RCAs can trial TCDs as part of pilots and choose how they notify people about TCD trials.</p> <p>Not supported. These are public streets and the public needs to know where/when public notification is required for ANY changes to streets. RCA's should never be permitted to 'choose' how they notify street changes, this has to be legislated to that the public knows.</p>
Proposal 2: Powers to filter and restrict traffic	

2A	<p>Enable RCAs to install modal filters if the objects they use are safe</p> <p>Strongly supported. However, we would expect that any proposed changes were publicly notified so people know that their use of a particular street will change. We would expect a 7 day notice period as with our other responses.</p>
2B	<p>Ensure legislation provides clear powers to filter traffic, by removing the requirement in the LGA1974 that facilities built on roads cannot, in the opinion of a council, “unduly impede vehicular traffic entering or using the road”</p> <p>Strongly supported with 7 days public notification.</p>
2C	<p>Enable RCAs to restrict or prohibit the use of some or all motor vehicles on specified roadways to support public transport use, active travel, health and safety, emissions reductions, and/or to create public spaces that promote community well-being.</p> <p>Strongly Support with 7days public notification.</p>
2D	<p>Provide RCAs with an explicit power to install TCDs</p> <p>We note that this question is targeted at RCA’s but in Auckland it raises some major issues. There does need to be some recognition that the statutory arrangements in Auckland are different from the rest of NZ. Although Auckland Council is owner of all roads/streets (except State Highways), Auckland Transport is the Community Controlled Organisation who has the RCA role in Auckland. We have serious concerns as to how Placemaking will have precedence over Movement if AT has the power to make changes to streets/roads that may not fit with AC’s future plans. This needs clarifying in any new legislation.</p>

Schools Streets

- | | |
|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Establish powers and requirements for RCAs to create School Streets in partnership with local schools.</p> <p>We note again, that this question is targeted at RCA’s but it does raise some major issues in Auckland in terms of who decides priority of Placemaking over Movement.</p> |
|---|---|

Community Streets

- | | |
|---|---|
| 4 | <p>Establish clear powers and requirements for residents to hold Community Streets, provided they have approval from RCAs.</p> <p>We support this proposal providing that Auckland Council has had the opportunity to consider the Placemaking aspects of any proposal first ahead of Auckland Transport facilitating the changes.</p> |
|---|---|

Closing roads for other functions and events

- | | |
|----|--|
| 5A | <p>Allow RCAs to close roads for reoccurring events, by removing the 31-day limit per year for road closures in the LGA1974</p> <p>Supported but with the same requirements for Auckland Council to have the decision making power and Auckland Transport to facilitate these.</p> |
| 5B | <p>Bring together powers and requirements to close roads for events in one piece of legislation and update notification requirements so that RCAs can notify the public in any way that they consider appropriate at least two weeks before an event.</p> <p>As with 5A, these proposals are all about Placemaking, not Movementso we would expect the decisions to be made by Auckland Council with Auckland Transport implementing.</p> |

Pedestrian Malls

6A	<p>Remove the requirement for local authorities to use the special consultative procedure when establishing pedestrian malls. Instead, they must apply the consultation principles in the LGA2002.</p> <p>This is a major issue in Auckland, where Auckland Transport, as the RCA considers that they have the role to create Pedestrian Malls, prepare the Management Plans and operate the malls. This has led to a focus on Movement rather than Placemaking so the Auckland specific legislation needs to change in order that Auckland Council picks up this Placemaking role.</p>
6B	<p>Remove the ability for people to appeal to the Environment Court when a pedestrian mall is being created. People would be able to challenge the installation of a pedestrian mall through judicial review.</p> <p>Supported.</p>
6C	<p>Shift legislative provisions for pedestrian malls to the proposed Street Layouts rule</p> <p>Supported subject to the necessary legislative changes that provide for Auckland Council to be the decision maker not Auckland Transport as the RCA in Auckland.</p>
<p>Transport shelters</p>	
7	<p>Remove special notification requirements for creating transport shelters. Instead, RCAs would be able to publicly consult on transport shelters in the same way they do for other features, like bus stops.</p> <p>Supported. However, we think that bus shelters should also be incorporated in the Placemaking role, rather than being an RCA Movement focussed function. The design and location of bus shelters should not be limited to just Movement – these can, and should be, a major Placemaking facility that ‘fits’ in a particular location. The designs could be totally different over a number of locations and reflect the Placemaking ethos of each specific location, e.g. in town and city centre, extending street veranda space and adding side panels on the area closest to the street/road, maybe a better design in some locations than installing a back on the shelter.</p>