

Ainslee Brown

From: Ainslee Brown
Sent: Tuesday, 2 February 2021 2:07 PM
To: Ainslee Brown
Subject: FW: Appendix C to Applicant's reply – email detailing communications between Jamie Povall and Catherine Hamilton regarding safety barriers [BUD-LIVE.FID762079]

From: Povall, Jamie <Jamie.Povall@stantec.com>
Sent: 26 January 2021 13:43
To: Anna McLellan <Anna.McLellan@gw.govt.nz>; Shannon.Watson@ghd.com
Cc: David Allen <David.Allen@buddlefindlay.com>; Esther Bennett <Esther.Bennett@buddlefindlay.com>; Van Halderen, Caroline <Caroline.VanHalderen@stantec.com>
Subject: Appendix C to Applicant's reply – email detailing communications between Jamie Povall and Catherine Hamilton regarding safety barriers

Hi Anna and Shannon

In her evidence Ms Hamilton raised concerns about safety barriers located on 2.5m sections of the shared path. During her presentation to the Panel she commented that the potential safety barriers were all within 2.5m wide sections of the path. In her opinion this raised perceptions of safety as a factor of recreation use and enjoyment. Her view is that the perceived hinderance of a high barrier within the 2.5m wide sections of the path could create an unpleasant recreation experience as people shy away from the barrier and the effective path width becomes even narrower. Furthermore, she considers the barrier prevents respite from the line of movement, other than towards the live lane of traffic. Ms Hamilton notes that she is not a traffic safety specialist, but has formed her views through research of best practice standards and codes, and by referencing exemplar projects.

Out of this arise three issues:

- 1/ Where are the safety barriers potentially located?
- 2/ Are safety barriers within areas of 2.5m path an issue?
- 3/ Are there alternative potential options?

Potential location

After Ms Hamilton's presentation I discussed the areas that may have safety barriers with Ms Hamilton. In particular he clarified that the design evolved so that the proposed safety-from-falling fence is not presently intended, and is not likely to occur, along the 2.5m wide narrowed sections of the shared path (as set out in Memoranda 4, 5 and 6 in response to further information requests). However, that outcome cannot be guaranteed until after detailed design.

Is this an issue?

In Ms Hamilton's email to the Panel of 17 December she stated that should sections of safety barrier be required within the 2.5m sections Ms Hamilton's opinion remains the same. My position is that use of safety barriers within 2.5m decisions of shared path, while not desirable because of the narrowing effect and shy implications, can be safely accommodated should they be shown to be needed and any such barriers would be assessed by the safety audit. In Ms Hamilton's opinion any audit needs to look at the barriers in terms of safety and recreation amenity as it is not only a matter of safety. In Ms Hamilton's opinion from a recreation perspective, the optimal state is to provide a recreation route that is safe and enjoyable. Mr Greenaway provided recreational evidence to the Panel but in my opinion this is a matter of consideration for detailed design when actual fall heights and locations of safety barriers are known. At that time, as set out below, there are options that may avoid the need for a barrier or provide localised wider path widths. As stated in Memorandum 6 (at [77]) "*HCC is taking a cautionary approach now by introducing safety barriers in selected areas as outlined in Julia William's plans. During the detailed design, the finer details will be determined once the heights of the seawalls (and drop off areas) have been accurately identified and the safety risk has been determined. ...*"

Another of Ms Hamilton's concerns was long stretches of contiguous barriers with no respite space. She considers that there should be a maximum distance before which respite space in the form of a lay-by or widening of the path is

provided. She also agrees, consistent with my comments above, that any such outcome needs to be tested through detailed design (and she adds potential simulation).

Potential options

Should there be a need for a safety barrier within parts of the 2.5m sections of the shared path both Ms Hamilton and I agree that there are numerous design options available (some were set out in Memorandum 5) to satisfactorily resolve safety issues. Those options (as above) would be explored at detailed design stage.

Those options include:

- Clear signage and other safety features such as pathway markings;
- Potential reliance on the second lower tier of the seawall to avoid a drop height greater than 1.0 m (although this would be circumstance specific and Mr Povall does not support general reliance on this approach from a safety perspective) and this could be used in combination with other measures such as the ; upstand as shown in the Evans Bay Parade photo below;
- Reducing the overhang between the upper and lower curve to provide additional width, without creating any further coastal encroachment;
- Potential fence location and design options (during the hearing Mr Wanty explained to the Panel that barriers can be designed to reduce such effects);
- Amending the width of the separator and road shoulder from the combined 600mm to a narrow width to provide additional useable width to path users. Similarly, I am satisfied that there are opportunities to create extra width on the narrower section of paths in detail design as required. Ms Hamilton has concerns that this would bring people closer to the live lane. We agree that all such issues will be addressed through design and the safety audit;
- Potential options for a lower height edge barrier as provided by Ms Hamilton such as for Tamaki Drive (in the photos attached to her email of 17 December 2020); and/or
- Potential options for a lower height edge barrier as utilised by Wellington City Council (see photo below on Evans Bay Parade).



Jamie Povall

CMEngNZ CPEng CEng IntPE
Director – Major Projects

Direct: 04 381 6744
Mobile: 027 294 4231

Stantec New Zealand
Level 13, 80 The Terrace
Wellington 6011



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email (including any attachments) is confidential and contains information which may be subject to legal privilege. If you have received this email in error, you may not read, use, copy, or distribute any part of it or disclose its content or existence. Please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this email, including any attachments, from your system.
