

#### 14. HAREWOOD ROAD PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE SAFETY

The Board considered a report providing information on the outcomes and recommendations of a traffic management study concerning pedestrian and cycle safety on Harewood Road between Sails Street and the railway line.

The Chairperson advised that although she lived in the area affected by the proposal, she had no pecuniary or non-pecuniary conflict of interest.

She advised that additional information had been sought from the report writer and it could now be reported that surveys of all pedestrian crossing movements between the railway and Harris Crescent over the period 8am to 5pm revealed a consistent number of pedestrians crossing Harewood Road. The total volume of crossing movements over the nine hour day was 484, with the maximum hourly volume being 22 movements in the section between St James Avenue and the railway during the hour ending 9am. Typically hourly volumes within each road section ranged between five and 15 movements. The number of sensitive pedestrians (elderly and young children) was typically less than three per hour and comprised approximately 11% of the total crossing movements. This information had been captured from static video use.

Paul Burden (consultant) clarified that the approximate cost of a zebra crossing with kerb extensions and lighting is \$80,000 and that there were no road safety or overall level of service benefits to road users with this option. The best solution was as presented – this separates the two traffic streams and mitigates existing problems. He had spoken to the Schools Coordinator in terms of child safety, and she had agreed this was the best solution.

Yvonne Palmer stated there was a need to investigate using a Road Safety Officer. Also, while recognising this was outside the scope of the project, signalised pedestrian and cyclist lights at the Harewood Road railway crossing needed investigation. It was agreed that the Pavement Maintenance Team Leader would be asked to investigate this.

Yvonne Palmer stated the need for an independent consultant to be used when the plan moved to the next stage of development. Megan Evans advised this was not a decision the Community Board should be making.

It was **resolved** that that the Board support the Traffic Management Plan in principle and that the Board seek a deputation to the Council asking for consideration for funding as a priority under the community outcome of a "Safe City".