



Minutes or action points: George Courts meeting

Date: 18 March 2024, 4pm-6.30pm

Attendees: George Court: Michael Rochelle Rochelle Rebekah Paul

Auckland Transport: Andrew Taylor, Jared Plumridge, Siobhan O'Donovan

Notes	Actions
<ul> <li>Auckland Transport presented the new proposal for Mercury Lane.</li> <li>Bollards just north of the Mercury Lane/Cross Street intersection.</li> <li>Bollards at the Mercury Lane/Karangahape Road intersection.</li> <li>Initially the bollards could remain down. Metrics for if/when the bollards would be put into play would be discussed with George Courts. <ul> <li>a. If/should this happen, it would not necessarily be 24/7 immediately but timeframes of use would respond to need.</li> <li>b. Bollards will not be utilised until AT have workable systems in place, tested and commissioned, to ensure that George Court owners' and residents' access to their building is not compromised.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Reversing the traffic flow from north of the George Courts carpark entrance on Mercury Lane to Karangahape Road (traffic flows towards Karangahape Road, i.e. northerly traffic flow).</li> <li>Two-way traffic from George Courts carpark to Cross St, i.e. retaining the existing southbound exit movement from George Courts carpark.</li> <li>Options for Mercury Lane exit onto Karangahape Road discussed. AT proposed - all red phase at intersection, bollard drops down (if activated), drivers mindful of pedestrians and cyclists, exit left. Alternative option for Mercury Lane exit phase discussed which requires stopping Karangahape Road peds and cyclists (which may have low compliance due to infrequent Mercury Lane phase). George Courts' preference was expressed for left and straight ahead (to motorways) out of Mercury Lane, although recognising they don't have this</li> </ul>	





<ul> <li>route at the moment, it is via Canada St. AT to consider this further and firm up our preferred option with justification.</li> <li>AT confirmed it has no ability to issue moving traffic infringements for the proposed restriction, it would rely on Police enforcement and would likely have low compliance. We cannot implement as a special vehicle lane (e.g. bus lane, or bus and GV lane) as special vehicle lanes are defined by class of vehicle, which is not a valid solution for George Courts.</li> <li>AT's preference is to place the bollards as close to Cross Street as possible otherwise expected issues with: <ul> <li>a. People turning into Mercury Lane and finding they need to turn around to get out.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul><li>b. Congestion in/near Cross Street.</li><li>c. Informal pick up/drop off congesting the area.</li></ul>	
Discussion	
<ul> <li>Bollards and the reversal of traffic flow:</li> <li>The use of bollards and the reversal of the traffic flow is not the preferred option for George Courts for the following reasons: <ul> <li>Concerns about access for visitors, family, friends, couriers, deliveries (different vehicles/no control over licence plate number), people moving in and out. AT confirmed George Courts access would not be compromised (see bullet point immediately below).</li> <li>To address concerns about access, number plate recognition technology is proposed, although it was accepted this would not efficiently cover all access requirements mentioned above. Therefore, an additional technology solution will be developed to enable more flexible use. A button in the foyer was not considered a great solution by George Courts due to delay, or if the resident was not in the building at the time. George Courts were keen on a mobile app. AT confirmed there is enough time for an appropriate solution to be developed with our BT team and bollard supplier and this would be integrated before the bollards are used.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	





<ul> <li>Ability to activate the bollards when required is considered essential, and George Courts may request they are activated to mitigate operational problems.</li> <li>Concerns around emissions from vehicles that are idling at the intersection of Mercury Lane waiting for the bollards to drop and for lights to change so they can exit the street into Karangahape Road/Pitt Street. Goerge Courts is keen to see zero emissions trucks only, although noted that not all their delivery companies use zero emissions vehicles. Auckland Transport said using bollards will ensure vehicle volumes are minimal, minimising emissions from vehicles.</li> <li>Concerns about having to pay in the future for access/maintenance (such as for a parking permit in Grey Lynn, etc.). AT confirmed George Courts would not have to pay to access their building.</li> <li>Concern that the Police would be less inclined to drive through the area if there are bollards in the way.</li> </ul>	Project team to engage with the Police and other Emergency Services to
Courts would be supportive of the proposals.	discuss further.
<ul> <li>Seating, garden beds, and loading and servicing:</li> <li>Seating would be minimal at the outset and introduced as appropriate. Metrics and timing of assessments for potential introduction of seating will be discussed with George Courts. It was agreed at the last meeting that a staged approach will be adopted to the installation of furniture, with a reduced minimum on the western side for initial opening. George Courts requested the seats outside their entrance not be installed on day one.</li> <li>Garden beds are not appropriate on the western side of the street due to services under the road – the cost to move services is high.</li> <li>Trucks/delivery vehicles could be parked on the western side, opposite the entrance to the building.</li> </ul>	Project team to review and respond on extent of initial seating installation
<ul> <li>Public toilets:</li> <li>The proposed public toilets are still not in the design, but Auckland Council is working with our design engineers. George Courts received an email from Auckland Council's PM declining the invitation to attend the Monday meeting. AC is planning a consultation event for April.</li> </ul>	





<ul> <li>George Courts restated their opposition to the public toilets for the same reasons as previously.</li> <li>Rebekah voiced her concern that AC's consultation in April would not seem to be legitimate to them.</li> <li>Stormwater</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>George Courts wanted confirmation that future stormwater requirements had been considered when planning the work.</li> <li>They also asked whether existing downpipes from their building that spill onto the pavement can be connected into the stormwater system.</li> </ul>	Andrew to get back to George Courts re private stormwater connections and stormwater design for the project.
Catenary light poles:	
<ul> <li>There is a pole in front of the entrance to the George Courts building.</li> </ul>	
Some concern about this location was expressed and a	
<ul> <li>request was made to shift it, possibly closer to the tree pit.</li> <li>Andy confirmed the pole is 3m from the building frontage,</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Analy confirmed the pole is 3m from the building frontage, and explained there will be a clear, accessible zone 3m wide</li> </ul>	
along both sides of the street, free from obstructions such as furniture, poles or garden beds.	
Construction Programme	
<ul> <li>Andy advised construction is currently targeted to commence early June and will be done in stages along Mercury Lane. The works will take around 14-16 months in total on Mercury Lane.</li> <li>Vehicle access to George Court building and Mercury Theatre</li> </ul>	
will be maintained at all times, pedestrian access along the street will also be maintained at all times.	
<ul> <li>George Courts surprised at the length of time construction will take, which can be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	
Next meeting – 2-3 weeks' time:	
1. Confirmation of amount and location of furniture.	AT/Ciabban to service
2. Confirmation of bollard locations.	AT/Siobhan to arrange
<ol><li>Construction team to attend and phasing of the work to be discussed.</li></ol>	another meeting time.
	1