



Minutes or Actions Points

Project K PCG Update – Neighbourhood Improvements for Karanga-a-hape Station

Date: 12 March 2025

Time: 2.30pm

Venue: Microsoft Teams Meeting - Online

Invitees: Jane Small (PCG Chair)
Suresh Patel (PCG member)
Melanie Alexander (PCG member)

Daryl McIntosh (AT)
Cianell Greenough (AT)
Remi Cruz (AT)
Ian Kingston (Project Manager)
Manoj Nathoo (AT)
Brianna Fuller (AT)
Isabella Wang (AC)
Edward Wright (AT)
Sandy Webb (AT)
Siobhan O'Donovan (AT)
Sophia Wang (AT)
Robyn Burrell (ALTA)

Apologies: Eric Van Essen (PCG member) Luke Donald
Jenny Larking (AC PCG member)

Item	Topic Update Actions	Responsible
1.	Introduction	
1.1.	A brief introduction of the project was provided, highlighting the purpose of the PCG meeting, which was to discuss design changes and seek approval for these changes.	Suresh Patel
1.2.	Changes to the project team were also discussed, with Ian Kingston stepping in to the Project Manager and Engineer's Representative roles. Thank you to Robyn Burrell for taking the project up to this point. Andrew Taylor remains as Engineer to the Contract (EtC).	Jason Budd
2.	Construction Update	
2.1.	Construction update provided referring to staging plans in the presentation. Project scheduled to be completed on the 3 October 2025.	Ian Kingston
2.2.	Physical works contractor is JFC delivering the main package of work (Pitt St, Mercury Lane) and the interim streets package (Cross St, Canada St & East St).	
2.3.	Extensions of time (EOT) have been approved by the EtC. The Contractor has been requested to accelerate to recover some of the approved EOT. The project completion date still aligns with the expected completion date agreed with the CRL.	
2.4.	Isabella asked whether access to the public toilet on Mercury Lane was being maintained during construction? Ian confirmed yes it was.	

3.	Financial Update	
3.1.	A financial update was provided, mentioning the various sources (NZTA, AC and AT) of funding and the current project budget. At present, the current project budget is sufficient. There has also been some additional funding for the public toilets and for some other works (stormwater pipe replacement), so this has been added to the bucket to pay for the project works.	Suresh Patel
3.2.	Total forecast cost for the project is \$15.83M. The project is currently tracking within the contingency allowance (\$1.14M) with half of the contingency amount used to date. Project spend to date is \$3.8M which is behind the original forecast however this is largely due to the late start of physical works (original scheduled to commence in May 2024) in July 2024. Anticipated deferrals at the end of this FY are \$1.8M.	Ian Kingston
3.3.	Jane requested clarification – To date we have used half of the contingency but are only a third through our forecast spend. Are we tracking to budget? We've used that much of our contingency already; however, we've spent not quite \$4.0M and the overall construction forecast is approximately \$12M?	Jane Small
3.4.	Ian responded – Yes that is correct. Most of the high-risk elements (excavations for tree pits) are completed and we anticipate that the remaining work will be more straight forward. The higher value streetscape works are also yet to be delivered.	Ian Kingston
4.	Proposed Amendments to Cross Street Design – PCG Direction Required	
4.1.	Direction from the PCG is sort for design amendments to the interim streets designs. The amendments include Cross Street, East Street and Canada Street which all have Engineering Plan Approval (EPA).	Jason Budd
4.2.	Towards the end of last year AT were approached by some key stakeholders (building and business owners) from Cross Street and East Street, requesting some amendments to the interim streets designs. This engagement was via the project Development Response person Manoj Nathoo.	
4.3.	For Cross Street, we had some quite robust discussions with some local stakeholders, such as Moi Chow, who is the property owner of Lim Chow, plus some other property owners, like Peter Watt, Marie Rose and Craig Miller. Discussions were also held with other business owners like Carlo from Bar Magda. Essentially the feedback was that they wanted a number of changes as listed on the slide (PowerPoint).	Manoj Nathoo
4.4.	On the southern side of Cross Street, the project was going to construct an on-road pedestrian footpath, using concrete separators. However, along the edge of the road, there is a fence adjacent the Wilson car park that's made-up of steel pipe which has non-complying gaps (greater than 0.5m) which might be a risk of someone falling through the fence into the pit below which is up to 1.4m deep. The project team have spoken to the Road Asset team who advise that if we remove the risk, which is essentially the new footpath, then we don't need to do anything with the fence. The	Manoj Nathoo

	recommendation is to not install the footpath and therefore remove the need to undertake any remediation to the fence.	
4.5.	<p>We're doing a whole lot of works in this area to improve the precinct. It is predicted that there will be a lot more people who are going to be moving through here from a pedestrian perspective, regardless of whether or not there is a footpath. Can we find funding to address the safety issue?</p> <p>Action – Project team to look at options for funding replacement of the fence</p>	Jane Small / Melanie Alexander / Suresh Patel
4.6.	Referring to the changes (removal of proposed footpath, loading zones, etc) proposed to Cross Street and bearing in mind that the project has undertaken extensive consultation and been for TCC resolution in December last year, have we consulted with all stakeholders such as the Local Board? We need to be clear how we have agreed to make these changes.	Melanie Alexander
4.7.	We have engaged with a group of local stakeholders that have given feedback. That is where the changes have come from. They are the ones who are most affected by what is proposed. But you're right, there does need to be a level of engagement with the wider community about these changes again. And I acknowledge that this has gone through TCC already. And the designs have already been widely publicised to the community.	Suresh Patel
4.8.	To answer your question, I met with Murray Burt on this yesterday. My understanding is the project team have done consultation. This includes the design team and other SME's across the business. It may not yet have been formalised through TCC but has been through a process. Politically and for a whole raft of other reasons, it would be unwise of us not to proceed with these changes now.	Jane Small
4.9.	We will confirm the changes with the local board. Consultation has been done with the affected stakeholders.	Suresh Patel
4.10.	These amendments have been done because of feedback that has been received through consultation and while not everyone agrees with the changes and as we all know, this is a very contentious area, the changes are meeting the concerns of those that are immediately affected and have perhaps been the most vocal.	Jane Small
4.11.	It was agreed we would confirm the proposed changes with the local board and through the community liaison group before implementing the changes.	Jason Budd
4.12.	I would like to know if we have done the design checks. Have we got buy in from the community? Have we done the appropriate safety audits, etcetera, that's what we need to hear. And if that's happened, I don't have particular concern about these things moving forward. If we are doing that, that's what the PCG would like. That gives me confidence as a PCG member.	Melanie Alexander
4.13.	To answer your question, the draft design has been developed since late last year and during the last few months we have engaged with the relevant internal SMEs, including the road safety engineer, traffic engineer, CCNO and the parking design team. We have also engaged with our active mode specialist in the design and standards team. A few revisions have happened already, and comments taken on board. This is the revision we have presented. The road safety engineer also suggested the project team to	Sophia Wang

	<p>undertake a SSA addendum for these changes, which our project team will do once we agree the final layout with you and the local board, then we will proceed with the detailed design.</p> <p>Action – Project team to confirm changes with SME's, consult with local board and community. Outcome of this engagement to be shared back to the PCG next month and decision.</p>	
5.	Proposed Amendments to East/Canada Street Design – PCG Direction Required	
5.1.	<p>Proposed changes to improve local access and make East Street two-way presented to the PCG. The changes proposed here were led by a number of local stakeholders, especially landlords like Moi Chow and the K 'Road Business Association. The main background to this for businesses was to ensure access to loading and servicing because of restricting Mercury Lane to a northerly traffic flow. For southbound vehicles wanting to come back into the area, the only way is to go all the way down K 'Road via Newton Road and then come back via Upper Queen Street. This is quite a long route to come back, so there is a desire for us to consider improved local access and make East Street two way.</p>	Manoj Nathoo
5.2.	<p>The current design has East Street as a two-way operation from K 'Rd terminating at the intersection with South Street. Past South Street it is proposed to only allow northbound traffic flow.</p>	Sophia Wang
5.3.	<p>The proposed design amendment is to provide two-way traffic flow along the whole length of East Street joining with Canada Street. To do that, we will modify the space allocation a bit between South Street to Canada Street, so the main change is that cyclists will share the road space with vehicles travelling north from the Mercury/Canada Street roundabout.</p>	Sophia Wang
5.4.	<p>Tracking and visibility has been checked. As for Cross Street the same process will be undertaken with the local board and the community liaison group. A Safe Systems Assessment will also be undertaken.</p>	Sophia Wang
5.5.	<p>Jane and Melanie, along with Jenny Larking support the proposed amendments for East Street/Mercury Lane/Canada Street.</p> <p>Action – Project team to confirm changes with SME's, consult with local board and community. Outcome of this engagement to be shared back to the PCG next month and decision.</p>	
6.	Mercury Lane Furniture – PCG Direction Required	
6.1.	<p>Prior to the start of construction the project team engaged with George Courts as a key stakeholder on Mercury Lane, who flagged concern regarding anti-social behaviour on Mercury Lane outside the entrances to their building including the basement car park entrance off Mercury Lane. As a result of those discussions, it was agreed to reduce the amount of street furniture such as seating to remove occurrence of people loitering outside their entrances. George Courts have previously reported issues with people waiting outside their entrances, and when doors open, run into the building. Recently the project team have had further feedback from George Courts requesting that we remove all seating, at least immediately around the entrances to their building.</p> <p>There is a concern from the project team, particularly from our designers, that this will have a major impact on the shared space</p>	Jason Budd

	environment that we're attempting to create. There will also be an impact on disabled users as Mercury Lane is quite a steep. The seating was originally intended to provide resting points for people as they make their way up Mercury Lane from the station entrance.	
6.2.	George Courts have said they are happy to have single seats available for disabled users, but they feel that the seating around the tree pits is quite excessive and will just create a place to loiter. To date we have not responded to George Courts request, saying that we would bring this request to our PCG to get direction. Most of the seating that we have is around the three tree pits which are very close to the George court entrance, especially the most southern tree pit.	Manoj Nathoo
6.3.	In the original design there was a lot more seating on the western side of Mercury Lane and some single seating down towards the George Court apartment entrance. On feedback from the locals, we removed a number of these seats. So, what is left now is quite a lot less than what was originally proposed. We are now being pressured to remove a lot more, which is not a good outcome for our customers, we believe.	Suresh Patel
6.4.	I think we need to proceed with retaining the present level of seating. We have a group of residents who are concerned around anti-social behaviour outside their apartments. That's the nature of the environment that they live in unfortunately. From a broader user perspective having some seating in that area and particularly with the station coming into play and people with mobility issues who might need a rest on Mercury Lane as they walk up the lane, I think we need to keep to the current design.	Jane Small
6.5.	Jenny's comments are like what Jane just said. She also asked the question whether Mercury Line will have any security cameras?	Isabella Wang
6.6.	Yes, there will be some CCTV in operation in the area. Action – PCG to confirm the current street furniture design to remain as part of the streetscape design for Mercury Lane. The project team will then respond to George Courts.	Manoj Nathoo
7.	Mercury Lane Operations – PCG Information and Feedback	
7.1.	The proposed operational changes to Mercury Lane were summarised, including the installation of retractable bollards. Mercury Lane is changing to a shared space, with traffic flow proposed to be from south to north only (one direction) up onto K Road. Retractable bollards are being installed as a modal filter at the top of Mercury Lane and at the intersection with Cross Street. These will initially not be operational. Vehicles from the George Courts basement car park will still be able to exit in both directions (north and south). Should pedestrian activity increase after the opening of the CRL, consideration will be given to operating the modal filter based on the triggers as listed on the slide. Are there any questions on this?	Jason Budd
7.2.	Yes. I am a little bit surprised there isn't a safety trigger. AT has experience of a high number of incidences or near misses when there is an increase in pedestrian volume. The current triggers are all about traffic volumes, but the idea of the bollards is to protect people's safety (pedestrians). If we see a significant number of	Melanie Alexander

	<p>pedestrians coming out of the station for instance at certain times of the day, we may need to close the road to ensure that pedestrians can move safely in the environment.</p> <p>Action – Project team to review the triggers for the bollards to become operational and to consider including pedestrian safety. Triggers to be presented and endorsed at the next PCG.</p>	
8.	End State Issues – PCG Direction Required	
8.1.	Gobo projectors – Ownership and maintenance to be confirmed. These need to be owned and maintained by Auckland Council (AC) as they are not something that AT would look after. To date AC (Community Facilities) have advised they will not take these on.	Manoj Nathoo / Jason Budd
8.2.	If we can't find an owner, it would be prudent for us to delete the Gobo projectors from the project.	Manoj Nathoo
8.3.	Can you pass this onto Jenny Larking and ask her? Be very clear that if someone in Council can't own and maintain them, then the projectors will have to be deleted.	Jane Small
8.4.	Currently the project is proceeding with procurement of the projectors as it was assumed that an asset owner would be found. At present the project already have a sunk cost of between \$60 to \$80k for the projectors and light poles.	Jason Budd
8.5.	<p>This needs to be escalated in Jenny's team to possibly Tarran? Send me some details and I will communicate with Jenny and Tarran.</p> <p>Before I do that though, can I understand what the role of Council for this project has been?</p>	Jane Small
8.6.	They are a co-funder (\$4.2M) via a Group Services Agreement.	Jason Budd
8.7.	Council was part of the design phase, via a Project Working Group which included council urban designers who had input on the landscaping design elements.	Sophia Wang
8.8.	<p>We need to understand the split between the Gobo projectors and the artwork, although I believe they still wouldn't fall within our remit for ownership and maintenance. Let's understand what the maintenance contracts are for shared spaces such as these. I know AT does do some maintenance in spaces like these. So, let's have a conversation first with Allan Wallace and Myles Lind to understand how this works and then we can escalate it with Council.</p> <p>Action – Project team to engage with the Corridor Maintenance team to understand what maintenance they would undertake for a space like Mercury Lane with infrastructure such as the Gobo projectors.</p>	Jane Small
8.9.	<p>Isabella, you're hearing the message clearly. Can you start the conversation internally at Council. As you will appreciate, this is an Urban Realm element not a transport element.</p> <p>Action – Isabella to discuss ownership of the Gobo projectors with Jenny and Tarran. Report back to Ian Kingston on the outcome of this discussion.</p>	Jane Small / Isabella Wang
8.10.	Ian to share with Jane, Isabella's feedback. If needed Jane will discuss with Jenny.	Ian Kingston / Jane Small

8.11.	<p>The other one, we needed direction on is providing amenity power supply. We have talked to our lighting team, but it's non-standard for them to provide an amenity power supply with our current lighting poles. So, we just wanted to get some direction here. This is for activations or events within the precinct.</p> <p>Action – Isabella to discuss how amenity supply could be included as part of the project as well as being owned and maintained by Council with Jenny and Tarran. Report back to Ian Kingston on the outcome of this discussion.</p>	Manoj Nathoo / Isabella Wang / Ian Kingston
9.	Station Precinct CPTED Assessment – Seeking PCG Support	
9.1.	<p>CPTED assessment has been completed for the site. This was a nighttime audit and has resulted in certain recommendations. Primarily we're looking for advocacy and support for some funding to make some improvements, particularly around pedestrian orientated lighting, some beacons on Greys Avenue where the pedestrian crossing is to enhance the visibility of the crossing. The most important need is for additional CCTV cameras estimated to come at a cost of about \$155,000. Which will provide good value in terms of surveillance for the area.</p>	Manoj Nathoo
9.2.	<p>Have you confirmed with ATOC that they have the manpower to monitor the cameras? With 26 additional CCTV cameras is there going to be any 'smarts' on them? That's a lot of CCTV cameras for somebody to monitor. So, unless you've got dedicated resource, how are you going to use them to their best advantage, noting what Suresh said that some of them will be enforcement cameras, which will be linked up to parking.</p>	Melanie Alexander
9.3.	<p>Good point. We'll take that on board. For the last couple of points, we will engage with Jenny's team and Isabella regarding the routine maintenance and community events around the area.</p> <p>Action – Project team to investigate operation of CCTV cameras. Team to also liaise with Council on maintenance and community events.</p>	Manoj Nathoo
10.	Meeting Concluded	
10.1.	<p>Meeting concluded. Minutes will be prepared and actions listed. These will be circulated shortly. A signing page will also be added to the minutes for the PCG members to sign.</p>	Jason Budd
10.2.	<p>Yes, we have a few actions arising out of today. It would be helpful to have another meeting in the next month to review the decisions made, rather than by circulation of the minutes, so even if you haven't got decisions that need to be made, we can just check in on those actions. And whether it's in a month's time or a month and a half. But I would suggest in a month to try and close out the actions and get the feedback from the community.</p>	Jane Small
10.3.	Meeting Adjourned at 4:00 PM	
Next Meeting – 30 April 2025 – 2.30pm – On Teams		



PCG APPROVAL

I am satisfied that the minutes as presented above represent the discussions that took place in the meeting and the actions to be completed are correct for the continued delivery of the project.

PCG Member	Signature / Date
Chair – Jane Small (AT)	
Suresh Patel (AT)	
Melanie Alexander (AT)	
Eric Van Essen (AT)	
Jenny Larking (AC)	

